NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DCXVIII.

JULY 5, 1907.

CHAPTERS FROM MY AUTOBIOGRAPHY—XX.*

BY MARK TWAIN.

PREFATORY NOTE.—Mr. Clemens began to write his autobiography many years ago, and he continues to add to it day by day. It was his original intention to permit no publication of his memoirs until after his death; but, after leaving "Pier No. 70," he concluded that a considerable portion might now suitably be given to the public. It is that portion, garnered from the quarter-million of words already written, which will appear in this REVIEW during the coming year. No part of the autobiography will be published in book form during the lifetime of the author.—EDITOR N. A. R.

[*Notes on "Innocents Abroad." Dictated in Florence, Italy, April, 1904.*]—I will begin with a note upon the dedication. I wrote the book in the months of March and April, 1868, in San Francisco. It was published in August, 1869. Three years afterward Mr. Goodman, of Virginia City, Nevada, on whose newspaper I had served ten years before, came East, and we were walking down Broadway one day when he said: "How did you come to steal Oliver Wendell Holmes's dedication and put it in your book?"

(1868.)

I made a careless and inconsequential answer, for I supposed he was joking. But he assured me that he was in earnest. He

*Copyright, 1906, by HARPER & BROTHERS. All Rights Reserved.

Copyright, 1907, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY All Rights Reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

said: "I'm not discussing the question of whether you stole it or didn't—for that is a question that can be settled in the first bookstore we come to—I am only asking you *how* you came to steal it, for that is where my curiosity is focalized."

I couldn't accommodate him with this information, as I hadn't it in stock. I could have made oath that I had not stolen anything, therefore my vanity was not hurt nor my spirit troubled. At bottom I supposed that he had mistaken another book for mine, and was now getting himself into an untenable place and preparing sorrow for himself and triumph for me. We entered a bookstore and he asked for "The Innocents Abroad" and for the dainty little blue and gold edition of Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes's poems. He opened the books, exposed their dedications and said: "Read them. It is plain that the author of the second one stole the first one, isn't it?"

I was very much ashamed, and unspeakably astonished. We continued our walk, but I was not able to throw any gleam of light upon that original question of his. I could not remember ever having seen Dr. Holmes's dedication. I knew the poems, but the dedication was new to me.

I did not get hold of the key to that secret until months afterward, then it came in a curious way, and yet it was a natural way; for the natural way provided by nature and the construction of the human mind for the discovery of a forgotten event is to employ another forgotten event for its resurrection.

I received a letter from the Rev. Dr. Rising, who had been rector of the Episcopal church in Virginia City in my time, in (1866.) which letter Dr. Rising made reference to certain things which had happened to us in the Sandwich Islands six years before; among things he made casual mention of the Honolulu Hotel's poverty in the matter of literature. At first I did not see the bearing of the remark, it called nothing to my mind. But presently it did—with a flash! There was but one book in Mr. Kirchhof's hotel, and that was the first volume of Dr. Holmes's blue and gold series. I had had a fortnight's chance to get well acquainted with its contents, for I had ridden around the big island (Hawaii) on horseback and had brought back so many saddle boils that if there had been a duty on them it would have bankrupted me to pay it. They kept me in my room, unclothed, and in persistent pain for two weeks, with no company

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but cigars and the little volume of poems. Of course I read them almost constantly; I read them from beginning to end, then read them backwards, then began in the middle and read them both ways, then read them wrong end first and upside down. In a word, I read the book to rags, and was infinitely grateful to the hand that wrote it.

Here we have an exhibition of what repetition can do, when persisted in daily and hourly over a considerable stretch of time, where one is merely reading for entertainment, without thought or intention of preserving in the memory that which is read. It is a process which in the course of years dries all the juice out of a familiar verse of Scripture, leaving nothing but a sapless husk behind. In that case you at least know the origin of the husk, but in the case in point I apparently preserved the husk but presently forgot whence it came. It lay lost in some dim corner of my memory a year or two, then came forward when I needed a dedication, and was promptly mistaken by me as a child of my own happy fancy.

I was new, I was ignorant, the mysteries of the human mind were a sealed book to me as yet, and I stupidly looked upon myself as a tough and unforgivable criminal. I wrote to Dr. Holmes and told him the whole disgraceful affair, implored him in impassioned language to believe that I had never intended to commit this crime, and was unaware that I had committed it until I was confronted with the awful evidence. I have lost his answer, I could better have afforded to lose an uncle. Of these I had a surplus, many of them of no real value to me, but that letter was beyond price, beyond uncledom, and unsparable. In it Dr. Holmes laughed the kindest and healingest laugh over the whole matter, and at considerable length and in happy phrase assured me that there was no crime in unconscious plagiarism; that I committed it every day, that he committed it every day, that every man alive on the earth who writes or speaks commits it every day and not merely once or twice but every time he opens his mouth; that all our phrasings are spiritualized shadows cast multitudinously from our readings; that no happy phrase of ours is ever quite original with us, there is nothing of our own in it except some slight change born of our temperament, character, environment, teachings and associations; that this slight change differentiates it from another man's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manner of saying it, stamps it with our special style, and makes it our own for the time being; all the rest of it being old, moldy, antique, and smelling of the breath of a thousand generations of them that have passed it over their teeth before!

In the thirty-odd years which have come and gone since then, I have satisfied myself that what Dr. Holmes said was true.

I wish to make a note upon the preface of the "Innocents." In the last paragraph of that brief preface, I speak of the proprietors of the "Daily Alta California" having "waived their rights" in certain letters which I wrote for that journal while absent on the "Quaker City" trip. I was young then, I am white-headed now, but the insult of that word rankles yet, now that I am reading that paragraph for the first time in many years, reading it for the first time since it was written, perhaps. There were rights, it is true—such rights as the strong are able to acquire over the weak and the absent. Early in '66 George Barnes invited me to resign my reportership on his paper, the San Francisco "Morning Call," and for some months thereafter I was without money or work; then I had a pleasant turn of fortune. The proprietors of the "Sacramento Union," a great and influential daily journal, sent me to the Sandwich Islands to write four letters a month at twenty dollars apiece. I was there four or five months, and returned to find myself about the best known honest man on the Pacific Coast. Thomas McGuire, proprietor of several theatres, said that now was the time to make my fortune—strike while the iron was hot! —break into the lecture field! I did it. I announced a lecture on the Sandwich Islands, closing the advertisement with the remark, "Admission one dollar; doors open at half-past 7, the trouble begins at 8." A true prophecy. The trouble certainly did begin at 8, when I found myself in front of the only audience I had ever faced, for the fright which pervaded me from head to foot was paralyzing. It lasted two minutes and was as bitter as death, the memory of it is indestructible, but it had its compensations, for it made me immune from timidity before audiences for all time to come. I lectured in all the principal Californian towns and in Nevada, then lectured once or twice more in San Francisco, then retired from the field rich—for me—and laid out a plan to sail Westward from San Francisco, and go around the world. The proprietors of the "Alta" engaged me

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to write an account of the trip for that paper—fifty letters of a column and a half each, which would be about two thousand words per letter, and the pay to be twenty dollars per letter.

I went East to St. Louis to say good-bye to my mother, and then I was bitten by the prospectus of Captain Duncan of the "Quaker City" excursion, and I ended by joining it. During the trip I wrote and sent the fifty letters; six of them miscarried, and I wrote six new ones to complete my contract. Then I put together a lecture on the trip and delivered it in San Francisco at great and satisfactory pecuniary profit, then I branched out into the country and was aghast at the result: I had been entirely forgotten, I never had people enough in my houses to sit as a jury of inquest on my lost reputation! I inquired into this curious condition of things and found that the thrifty owners of that prodigiously rich "Alta" newspaper had *copyrighted* all those poor little twenty-dollar letters, and had threatened with prosecution any journal which should venture to copy a paragraph from them!

And there I was! I had contracted to furnish a large book, concerning the excursion, to the American Publishing Co. of Hartford, and I supposed I should need all those letters to fill it out with. I was in an uncomfortable situation—that is, if the proprietors of this stealthily acquired copyright should refuse to let me use the letters. That is just what they did; Mr. Mac—something—I have forgotten the rest of his name—said his firm were going to make a book out of the letters in order to get back the thousand dollars which they had paid for them. I said that if they had acted fairly and honorably, and had allowed the country press to use the letters or portions of them, my lecture-skirmish on the coast would have paid me ten thousand dollars, whereas the "Alta" had lost me that amount. Then he offered a compromise: he would publish the book and allow me ten per cent. royalty on it. The compromise did not appeal to me, and I said so. I was now quite unknown outside of San Francisco, the book's sale would be confined to that city, and my royalty would not pay me enough to board me three months; whereas my Eastern contract, if carried out, could be profitable to me, for I had a sort of reputation on the Atlantic seaboard acquired through the publication of six excursion-letters in the New York "Tribune" and one or two in the "Herald."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the end Mr. Mac agreed to suppress his book, on certain conditions: in my preface I must thank the "Alta" for waiving its "rights" and granting me permission. I objected to the thanks. I could not with any large degree of sincerity thank the "Alta" for bankrupting my lecture-raid. After considerable debate my point was conceded and the thanks left out.

Noah Brooks was the editor of the "Alta" at the time, a man of sterling character and equipped with a right heart, also a good historian where facts were not essential. In biographical sketches of me written many years afterward (1902), he was quite eloquent in praises of the generosity of the "Alta" people in giving to me without compensation a book which, as history had afterward shown, was worth a fortune. After all the fuss, I did not levy heavily upon the "Alta" letters. I found that they were newspaper matter, not book matter. They had been written here and there and yonder, as opportunity had given me a chance working-moment or two during our feverish flight around about Europe or in the furnace-heat of my state-room on board the "Quaker City," therefore they were loosely constructed, and needed to have some of the wind and water squeezed out of them. I used several of them—ten or twelve, perhaps. I wrote the rest of "The Innocents Abroad" in sixty days, and I could have added a fortnight's labor with the pen and gotten along without the letters altogether. I was very young in those days, exceedingly young, marvellously young, younger than I am now, younger than I shall ever be again, by hundreds of years. I worked every night from eleven or twelve until broad day in the morning, and as I did two hundred thousand words in the sixty days, the average was more than three thousand words a day—nothing for Sir Walter Scott, nothing for Louis Stevenson, nothing for plenty of other people, but quite handsome for me. In 1897, when we were living in Tedworth Square, London, and I was writing the book called "Following the Equator" my average was eighteen hundred words a day; here in Florence (1904), my average seems to be fourteen hundred words per sitting of four or five hours.*

(1902.)

(1897.)

(1904.)

I was deducing from the above that I have been slowing down steadily in these thirty-six years, but I perceive that my

* With the pen, I mean. This Autobiography is dictated, not written.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

statistics have a defect: three thousand words in the spring of 1868 when I was working seven or eight or nine hours at a sitting has little or no advantage over the sitting of to-day, covering half the time and producing half the output. Figures often beguile me, particularly when I have the arranging of them myself; in which case the remark attributed to Disraeli would often apply with justice and force:

"There are three kinds of lies: lies, damned lies, and statistics."

[*Dictated, January 23, 1907.*]—The proverb says that Providence protects children and idiots. This is really true. I know it because I have tested it. It did not protect George through the most of his campaign, but it saved him in his last inning, and the veracity of the proverb stood confirmed.

I have several times been saved by this mysterious interposition, when I was manifestly in extreme peril. It has been common, all my life, for smart people to perceive in me an easy prey for selfish designs, and I have walked without suspicion into the trap set for me, yet have often come out unscathed, against all the likelihoods. More than forty years ago, in San Francisco, the office staff adjourned, upon conclusion of its work at two o'clock in the morning, to a great bowling establishment where there were twelve alleys. I was invited, rather perfunctorily, and as a matter of etiquette—by which I mean that I was invited politely, but not urgently. But when I diffidently declined, with thanks, and explained that I knew nothing about the game, those lively young fellows became at once eager and anxious and urgent to have my society. This flattered me, for I perceived no trap, and I innocently and gratefully accepted their invitation. I was given an alley all to myself. The boys explained the game to me, and they also explained to me that there would be an hour's play, and that the player who scored the fewest ten-strikes in the hour would have to provide oysters and beer for the combination. This disturbed me very seriously, since it promised me bankruptcy, and I was sorry that this detail had been overlooked in the beginning. But my pride would not allow me to back out now, so I stayed in, and did what I could to look satisfied and glad I had come. It is not likely that I looked as contented as I wanted to, but the others looked glad enough to make up for it, for they were quite unable to hide their evil joy. They showed me how to stand,

(1865.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and how to stoop, and how to aim the ball, and how to let fly; and then the game began. The results were astonishing. In my ignorance I delivered the balls in apparently every way except the right one; but no matter—during half an hour I never started a ball down the alley that didn't score a ten-strike, every time, at the other end. The others lost their grip early, and their joy along with it. Now and then one of them got a ten-strike, but the occurrence was so rare that it made no show alongside of my giant score. The boys surrendered at the end of the half-hour, and put on their coats and gathered around me and in courteous, but sufficiently definite, language expressed their opinion of an experience-worn and seasoned expert who would stoop to lying and deception in order to rob kind and well-meaning friends who had put their trust in him under the delusion that he was an honest and honorable person. I was not able to convince them that I had not lied, for now my character was gone, and they refused to attach any value to anything I said. The proprietor of the place stood by for a while saying nothing, then he came to my defence. He said: "It looks like a mystery, gentlemen, but it isn't a mystery after it's explained. That is a *grooved* alley; you've only to start a ball down it any way you please and the groove will do the rest; it will slam the ball against the northeast curve of the head pin every time, and nothing can save the ten from going down."

It was true. The boys made the experiment and they found that there was no art that could send a ball down that alley and fail to score a ten-strike with it. When I had told those boys that I knew nothing about that game I was speaking only the truth; but it was ever thus, all through my life: whenever I have diverged from custom and principle and uttered a truth, the rule has been that the hearer hadn't strength of mind enough to believe it.

A quarter of a century ago I arrived in London to lecture a few weeks under the management of George Dolby, who had conducted the Dickens readings in America five or six years before. He took me to the Albemarle and fed me, and in the course of the dinner he enlarged a good deal, and with great satisfaction, upon his reputation as a player of fifteen-ball pool, and when he learned by my testimony that I had never seen the game played, and knew nothing of the art of pocketing

(1873.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

balls, he enlarged more and more, and still more, and kept on enlarging, until I recognized that I was either in the presence of the very father of fifteen-ball pool or in the presence of his most immediate descendant. At the end of the dinner Dolby was eager to introduce me to the game and show me what he could do. We adjourned to the billiard-room and he framed the balls in a flat pyramid and told me to fire at the apex ball and then go on and do what I could toward pocketing the fifteen, after which he would take the cue and show me what a past-master of the game could do with those balls. I did as required. I began with the diffidence proper to my ignorant estate, and when I had finished my inning all the balls were in the pockets and Dolby was burying me under a volcanic irruption of acid sarcasms.

So I was a liar in Dolby's belief. He thought he had been sold, and at a cheap rate; but he divided his sarcasms quite fairly and quite equally between the two of us. He was full of ironical admiration of his childishness and innocence in letting a wandering and characterless and scandalous American load him up with deceptions of so transparent a character that they ought not to have deceived the house cat. On the other hand, he was remorselessly severe upon me for beguiling him, by studied and discreditable artifice, into bragging and boasting about his poor game in the presence of a professional expert disguised in lies and frauds, who could empty more balls in billiard pockets in an hour than he could empty into a basket in a day.

In the matter of fifteen-ball pool I never got Dolby's confidence wholly back, though I got it in other ways, and kept it until his death. I have played that game a number of times since, but that first time was the only time in my life that I have ever pocketed all the fifteen in a single inning.

My unsuspicious nature has made it necessary for Providence to save me from traps a number of times. Thirty years ago, a
(1876.) couple of Elmira bankers invited me to play the game of "Quaker" with them. I had never heard of the game before, and said that if it required intellect, I should not be able to entertain them. But they said it was merely a game of chance, and required no mentality—so I agreed to make a trial of it. They appointed four in the afternoon for the sacrifice. As the place, they chose a ground-floor room with a large win-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dow in it. Then they went treacherously around and advertised the "sell" which they were going to play upon me.

I arrived on time, and we began the game—with a large and eager free-list to superintend it. These superintendents were outside, with their noses pressed against the window-pane. The bankers described the game to me. So far as I recollect, the pattern of it was this: they had a pile of Mexican dollars on the table; twelve of them were of even date, fifty of them were of odd dates. The bankers were to separate a coin from the pile and hide it under a hand, and I must guess "odd" or "even." If I guessed correctly, the coin would be mine; if incorrectly, I lost a dollar. The first guess I made was "even," and was right. I guessed again, "even," and took the money. They fed me another one and I guessed "even" again, and took the money. I guessed "even" the fourth time, and took the money. It seemed to me that "even" was a good guess, and I might as well stay by it, which I did. I guessed "even" twelve times, and took the twelve dollars. I was doing as they secretly desired. Their experience of human nature had convinced them that any human being as innocent as my face proclaimed me to be, would repeat his first guess if it won, and would go on repeating it if it should continue to win. It was their belief that an innocent would be almost sure at the beginning to guess "even," and not "odd," and that if an innocent should guess "even" twelve times in succession and win every time, he would go on guessing "even" to the end—so it was their purpose to let me win those twelve even dates and then advance the odd dates, one by one, until I should lose fifty dollars, and furnish those superintendents something to laugh about for a week to come.

But it did not come out in that way; for by the time I had won the twelfth dollar and last even date, I withdrew from the game because it was so one-sided that it was monotonous, and did not entertain me. There was a burst of laughter from the superintendents at the window when I came out of the place, but I did not know what they were laughing at nor whom they were laughing at, and it was a matter of no interest to me anyway. Through that incident I acquired an enviable reputation for smartness and penetration, but it was not my due, for I had not penetrated anything that the cow could not have penetrated.

(To be Continued.) MARK TWAIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAS THE CONSERVATIVE SOUTH A PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE?

BY A NATIONAL DEMOCRAT.

THE Republican Party was in its origin and remains to this day a sectional party. Its Presidents, without exception, have been men of the North, and by the electoral votes of the Northern States they have attained office. With the exception of Maryland in 1896, no Southern State, save in the reconstruction period, when the white vote was in large part excluded, has ever given its electoral votes to a Republican candidate for the Presidency. The enactment of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, in 1854, precipitated the "irrepressible conflict" upon the slavery question and destroyed the Whig party; for upon that question the party was divided. The majority of the Northern Whigs were ready to join the Republican Party; the Southern Whigs became Democrats. Since that time, with the exception of the years when free government was suppressed in the South and military rule and the negro vote gave the Republicans a foothold there, the white Republicans of the South, a hopeless and impotent minority, have counted for little either in the councils of the party, in elections or in national or local legislation.

The strength of the Republican Party lies altogether in the North, and the sectional character of its aims and policy has been repeatedly reflected in the attempts of its chief statesmen to confirm and perpetuate its sway by diminishing the voice and influence of the Democratic South in Presidential and Congressional elections.

The Democratic Party is powerful alike in the North and in the South. It has elected many Democratic Governors, Congressmen and Senators in the Northern States. The present Governors of six Northern States are Democrats. When the Sixtieth Con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gress assembles next December, forty-seven Democrats from Northern States will have seats in the House of Representatives. In existence more than a century, the Democracy has always been a national party.

Yet in sixty years no Southern Democrat has been elected to the Presidency. James K. Polk of Tennessee, elected in 1844, was the last. Since the nomination of John C. Breckenridge of Kentucky in 1860, forty-seven years ago, that party has made no Southern man its candidate. McClellan, Seymour, Greeley—who was Northern, and Republican into the bargain—Tilden, Hancock, Cleveland, Bryan and Parker were all of the North.

Thus by custom and prescription it has come about that the men of one-half the Union are excluded from the honors of the Chief Magistracy. No statesman who is a citizen of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas or Virginia—thirteen States, with a geographical area of 793,000 square miles, and a population numbering 23,500,000—may ask his friends, in present conditions, to present his name to the great quadrennial council of his party as an aspirant to the nomination of the high office of President.

Ambition stirs the souls of Southern men, upon many among whom wisdom has been bestowed. The unwritten decree bids them choose, as the goal of the one and the field for the other, no higher place than a State office or a seat in the national House or Senate. The Constitution declares that no bill of attainder shall be passed; yet, by the custom and practice of parties, an unenacted attainder has wrought disqualification of a great part of the citizens of the Republic, debarring them from privileges and honors freely open to their fellow countrymen.

This practice, denounced by reason, repugnant to justice and opposed by considerations of the highest public welfare, is sustained only by an outworn sanction. It is time to make an end of it! The argument of political expediency no longer avails as the warrant and justification for debarring Southern Democrats from the Presidency. Rather have the march of years and of events, the changing opinions of men and the raising of new issues of weight and moment, brought the complete rehabilitation of the South clearly into the view of the Democratic Party as the path of wisdom and of safety.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The brave men of the South have a right to demand, and they should demand in the Presidential year of 1908, that this disability be forever removed, that they no longer be constrained to accept with unquestioning faith and loyalty the candidates the Northern Democrats may offer to their suffrages, and that the pathway to the White House shall once more be opened to their statesmen.

Have they not expiated the errors of the past by almost half a century of renunciation? Passions have cooled, old resentments are forgotten. If the uncalled-for question of the complete "reconstruction" of the South and of its entire loyalty to the Union be raised, let its contribution to the war that effaced the last vestige of Spanish dominion from the New World give the answer.

It is a weary rôle the Democracy of the South has been asked to play—to efface itself, always to defer to the judgment and to confirm the resolves of the Democrats of the North, to accept their candidates without question, to support them with devoted loyalty, and to follow them uncomplainingly to the defeat that, with two exceptions in fifty years, has been their doom. The position of the South has been hard. It has become unbearable. The Democrats of the former Slave States have had no option. Not two courses, only one has lain open to them. However little the candidate might be to their liking, no matter how slight might be the chance of his election, they have been forced by compelling considerations of their own welfare and safety to support him. To elect him, if possible, has been their hope. To maintain at all costs the control of their party, a party of white men, over the offices of their own States, has been with them a policy dictated by supreme need, and, although national candidates supported by the solid South have one after another gone down to defeat, the Democrats of these States have in all these years maintained an efficient party organization and have kept the State Governments in their own hands. They elect their Governors. Legislators chosen by them make the State laws. There is no shadow of doubt that men from any part of the country, in their place and with their experience and their memories of the wreck and ruin, the confusion, the scandals and the horror of negro domination, would do what they have done. Permanently establishing the government of white men in their respective States, which was the matter of supreme moment to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them, they have patiently put up with exclusion from the full privileges of their political birthright.

The time is ripe and overripe for change. It is time to discredit the contention that only a man from one section of the country can be trusted in the office of President. A little more than twenty years ago, Henry W. Grady, at the annual banquet of the New England Society in New York, spoke a message of cordial good-will from the South to the North. In the most eloquent passage of that memorable utterance he said, referring to the war between the States:

"I am glad that the omniscient God held the balance of battle in His mighty hand, and that human slavery was swept forever from American soil and the American Union was saved from the wreck of war."

He spoke of the imperishable brotherhood of the American people, and continued:

"Now, what answer has New England to this message? Will she permit the prejudice of war to remain in the hearts of the conquerors when it has died in the hearts of the conquered? Will she transmit this prejudice to the next generation that in their hearts, which never felt the generous ardor of conflict, it may perpetuate itself? Will she withhold, save in strained courtesy, the hand which, straight from his soldier's heart, Grant offered to Lee at Appomattox?"

It was the privilege of the conqueror to impose terms; the conquered must accept the consequence of defeat. The South took up arms to sever the Union of the States, thereby expecting to secure for itself the full enjoyment of what it considered its rights. It was mistaken; it lost its cause. It was in accordance with logic, with law and with usage, that it should be made to pass through a period of probation before it could be restored to its former status and receive back its political franchise. Well would it have been for the men and women of the Southern States, well for the whole Union, if Abraham Lincoln had been spared to carry out his far-seeing, wise and humane policy of reconstruction, as distinguished from the harsh, punitive policy later adopted under the leadership of Thaddeus Stevens, Charles Sumner, Ben Wade and Henry Winter Davis. To the contention of the Democrats, as expressed by their resolution in the House, that "acts of secession are not valid to destroy the Union and yet valid to destroy State Governments, and the political privileges of their citizens," there was no satisfactory answer.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lincoln's conditions of reconstruction included the ending of resistance, the appointment of provisional Governors, oaths of amnesty to be taken by at least one-tenth of the white voters, a Republican form of government without interference by Congress in the States, with no mention of negro suffrage.

Between this plan and the plan of reconstruction adopted by Congress in the heat and passion of the conflict with President Andrew Johnson, the plan of dividing the South into military districts under district commanders appointed by the President, having authority to annul the acts of State Governments which were provisional only, and might be superseded or abolished by the Federal law, there was all the difference that lies between a vengeful conqueror, making a desert and calling it peace, and a wise, far-seeing, great-minded ruler recalling to their allegiance his erring but not unforgivable provinces. Lincoln thought the South worth saving as an integral part of the Union of States. Thaddeus Stevens proposed to confiscate all of the estates of the rebels above the value of $10,000 or including more than 200 acres of land; each freedman to receive forty acres of land thus taken, and the residue of the spoil, estimated at that time at $3,500,000,000 to be applied to the payment of the national debt.

Toward a foreign enemy, distrusted and feared, which a conqueror intended to destroy utterly, such a policy would be at least intelligible, whatever might be said of its humanity. But the Southern States were to be brought back into the Union; they were to constitute a part of the national dominion, and in the view of a conqueror with even the slightest perception of the economic necessities of the period of upbuilding to follow the desolation of war, like Grant, who bade Lee retain the horses of his army as they would be needed for the spring ploughing, the policy advocated by Stevens would have seemed one of madness and barbarism.

Then came negro suffrage. If the Thirteenth Amendment prohibiting slavery were ratified, Lincoln was content to be "pretty nearly or quite done with Constitutional Amendments." Not so Sumner and the radical reconstructionists. Resistance on the part of the South to the outrages and oppressions of reconstruction measures, was to be punished by subjecting the white population to the rule of the negro, to the end that the fruits of reconstruction, as the dominant party had planned and imposed it,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might be made secure. The ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment was forced upon the States of the South, and reconstruction, except for its failures, its crimes, its frightful consequences to the people who were its victims, was complete.

Contemporary opinion of this work of oppression, in which passion supplanted patriotism and the establishment of party supremacy was made paramount to the reestablishment of the perfect union of the States, spoke its protest in a memorial addressed to Congress by the New York Chamber of Commerce. A special meeting of that body was held on May 10th, 1866, called to consider and report upon the tax proposed by Congress of five cents a pound on cotton. There was talk at the meeting of the tyranny of taxation without representation. It was pointed out that the unjust impost would deepen the economic blight that already rested upon the South. In the memorial occurs these passages:

"The Committee feel that it would be wiser and better to lift up those who are now cast down, and by just and generous legislation to inspire the Southern people with the hope of better days, rather than by an opposite course to prolong the era of political and commercial distrust. . . .

"It should appear in after-years, when prosperity in the South takes the place of present adversity and fraternal relations are again restored in and out of Congress, that in the days of her weakness the North and West did not take undue advantage of the South."

That voice of the larger statesmanship, that vision of the coming time when the conquered half of the Union should vie with the conquering half in adding to its wealth, and in helping us on in our irresistible progress toward our present greatness among nations, may have been heard, but it was not heeded. Yet it was all easy to foresee. To an unprejudiced mind the planning of a wise and saving policy would not have been difficult. Lincoln was without prejudice. He saw into the future. The "Elder Statesmen" of the New York Chamber of Commerce took thought of future years and gave wise counsel. But long after the last shot was fired, after the soldiers of the victorious army had returned to productive toil, while the defenders of the lost cause, vanquished, tattered, ruined, were seeking ways and means to begin life anew, the vindictive spirit swayed Congress, and in decades of stagnation and poverty the South and the country paid the penalty of that blindness and perversity.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Present opinion of the policy that prevailed forty years ago, and particularly of the policy of placing the ballot in the hands of freed slaves, may be read in a multitude of utterances.

Speaking at Lexington, Virginia, upon the occasion of the centennial of the birth of General Robert E. Lee on January 19th last, Charles Francis Adams used these words:

> "Because no blood flowed on the scaffold and no confiscation of homes or lands marked the close of our war of secession, it has always been assumed by us of the victorious party that extreme, indeed unprecedented, clemency was shown to the vanquished. On the contrary, it may not unfairly be doubted whether a people prostrated after civil strife has often received severer measure than was inflicted on the so-called reconstructed Confederate States immediately succeeding the close of strife."

Discredited at the time, repudiated by the political heirs of its authors and of its beneficiaries, condemned by the blight and disaster inflicted upon millions of people, the policy of ostracism pursued against the South has had its full day. If we are not now one Union of States, we never shall be one; and if either the passions of far-off conflict or the ban of long-past errors are still ghosts that can be made to walk and inspire fright, then it is clear that we are forevermore doomed to be not one people, but two.

It is not so. There is no taint of blood, no caste, no sectional disparity in this country of ours that abridges the privileges or bounds the honorable ambition of the men of one State more than those of another.

The Presidency is open to a candidate from the South.

Other reasons than considerations of human justice and the desire to make reparation for old wrongs, reasons of present vital force, commend the choice of a Southern Democrat for the honors of the nomination and of party leadership in 1908. It would be an act of wise national policy and of economic redemption. It would provide a way of escape from present-day tendencies toward courses of folly and of danger.

The South in coming years is undoubtedly to be the home of conservatism. It is to those States that we must look for sobered public opinion to oppose the radical doctrines that in the North have obscured the ancient faith of both parties, until, as Mr. Cleveland puts it, we see upon the banners borne by their leaders

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new and strange symbols betokening the adoption of principles born of the restless, unsteady spirit of innovation, principles untried in our national life and unsanctioned by experience.

Disputable as the assertion may appear, the South, through the greater part of its political history, has been guided by the spirit of conservatism. The Civil War, with all its dreadful waste and fought as it was to destroy the Union, originated chiefly in the South's desire to defend and conserve political and property rights it held to be inalienable. The men of the South believed in the sovereign right of a State to resist Federal encroachment, and impartial history now concedes that the necessary compromises of the Convention that framed the Constitution, compromises without which it would have failed of ratification by the States, left that great question undetermined, to be forever settled by the war of 1861-65. They believed slaves to be property, lawful property. The extreme and unhappy measures to which they resorted were for the protection of what they believed to be the rights of their States, and of their property rights, which they had persuaded themselves were under menace from the triumphant Republican Party.

That the Know-nothing movement obtained no foothold in the South was an evidence also of the conservatism of its people. That manifestation of a narrow and prejudiced radicalism was confined to the North, where it attained to the dignity of party organization and political importance. The speeches of Henry A. Wise of Virginia gave voice to the broader enlightenment of the South, which favored a liberal policy of welcome and assimilation toward emigrants from the Old World, whose sturdy arms and patient toil have been of immeasurable service in the development of our national resources.

If the reproach be brought against the South that it gave hospitable acceptance to the financial doctrines of Mr. Bryan in 1896, it may be replied that his ideas attained their greatest momentum in the West and Northwest, and that belief in the virtues of bimetallism had taken root in so many Republican minds that the Republican candidate of that year doubted the expediency of a gold-standard declaration, and only after being much labored with did he reluctantly consent to make such a declaration himself.

Furthermore, at St. Louis in 1904, Southern delegates showed,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as Mr. John Sharp Williams phrased it, that while their warm hearts prompted them to express by cheers their personal admiration for Mr. Bryan, their cool judgment rejected much of his counsel and sanctioned the choice of other guides.

But most of all, and conspicuously, the conservatism of the South is manifested in its present critical and repelling attitude toward the newer articles of the Bryan faith. While recently solicited expressions from representative Democrats of the North present Mr. Bryan as the candidate certain to be named by the Democratic Convention next year, no other name being under consideration, representative men and many of the prominent Democratic newspapers of the South openly dissent from his doctrines, discountenance his ambition and express the hope that in the coming contest the party banner may be committed to other hands.

From the time when in his Madison Square Garden speech, delivered upon his return from Europe, Mr. Bryan advocated the Government ownership of railroads as a cure for abuses of corporate privilege, thus evidently hoping to take some of the wind out of the sails of Mr. Roosevelt, then and now stretched taut by every favoring breeze of radicalism, the South has looked with cold reserve upon the ambitious projects of the Nebraskan. The people of the Southern States have abundant reason for "viewing with alarm" any project for putting the operation of their railroads, under Federal laws, into Federal hands; and although Mr. Bryan has amended and modified his Government ownership plan, and has even attempted to withdraw it from present public consideration, the South continues to feel and to proclaim a profound distrust of a statesman capable of formulating, out of hand, a policy so repugnant to the people of States that in two campaigns have given him their loyal support.

Of necessity, the South is committed to conservative courses by its very rapid increase in wealth and productive power. Men who, after incredible hardships, by their genius and their toil have accumulated property, are little inclined to put it in jeopardy by inviting to posts of Government control and responsibility the "ambitious, unsteady and unsafe" advocates of strange and subversive policies. Nor can a continuance of industrial prosperity so dearly won be imperilled by encouraging one of the contestants in a mad race of radicalism.

In the past six years, the value of the South's cotton crop has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exceeded by $1,185,963,100 the total value of the whole world's output of gold and silver. In two decades she has produced 184,182,400 bales of cotton, having a value of $7,929,530,837. In gold or credits her exports of raw cotton have brought to the country more than $2,000,000,000 in the last six years. In 1906, she produced 3,467,000 tons of pig-iron, $641,720,000 worth of cotton, farm products of the value of $2,000,000, lumber products of the value of $300,000,000, and the assessed value of her property was $8,025,000,000, an increase of nearly one hundred per cent. over the assessed valuation in 1890.

The South is astir with industrial life. From those States will come in the next decade the chief increase in the national wealth. Her best brains and her stoutest hands are engaged in the regeneration and the building up of her productive industries.

The voices, the votes and the influence of the men who are producing this new wealth in the South may surely be counted upon to help on any intelligently organized effort to rescue the Democratic Party from the perils of reckless adventures, and to set its feet once more in the path of safety.

The South has men of Presidential amplitude and capacity. She has but to come to a consciousness of her right, of her interest, of her power, and to offer to the Democracy of the nation a candidate of recognized worth to secure instant attention. If she would unite her forces with the Democrats of those Northern States where counsels of conservatism still prevail, or where such counsels would at once prevail if the path of hope and of success could be brought into view, the control of the National Convention could be secured, and the dawn of a new day would break upon the disorganized ranks of the Democracy.

These are but some of the reasons, for there are many others, why these States of the Union with a population of over twenty-three millions, the intelligent portion of which is already possessed by the spirit of conservatism, and by inclination no less than by interest is induced to follow conservative courses, should take their right and equal place in the coming great contest. So, I repeat, the path to the White House should not be closed to the men of the South, but rather broadened, that the standard of politics and government may be lifted up in our country.

A NATIONAL DEMOCRAT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STATE VALUATION OF RAILROADS. SOME OF THE PROBLEMS.

BY CHARLES HANSEL.

In 1900, an exhaustive and intelligent survey was made of every railroad in the State of Michigan—including rolling-stock in and out of the State, and every item owned, controlled or operated by the railroads—in order to determine their value for the purpose of taxation. The problems which arose in this study were numerous and complex, and the Governor decided to appoint a commission, composed of engineers from outside of the State, to adjudicate the various questions propounded by the engineer in charge of the survey. The writer was a member of this commission and fully appreciates the difficulty of establishing the value of a railroad, either for the purpose of taxation or ascertaining its general value to the State, or to all the States.

The Sunberg Committee of the Minnesota State Senate has lately made public a report setting forth the results of its study on the railways of Minnesota. This report does not advise us as to the object in view in attempting to place a valuation upon the property of the several railroads in that State. The terms "cost" and "value" are frequently used synonymously, but it is not always apparent that cost and value are directly related.

If the topography, climate, distribution of fuel and water, and the competition by means of navigation were equal throughout the State, and if an infinite mind had directed the development of the country in the location and construction of its railways, it might be practicable to establish the value and, also, a flat rate for service per mile for all railroads throughout the State. The value of a railroad to an undeveloped country, where it furnishes the only means of transport, cannot be measured by the same rule which may be applied to a more populous section.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comparisons between the railroads of Great Britain and the United States have been frequently attempted, generally to the disadvantage of this country. Such comparisons are of little value because of the widely different conditions which were attendant upon the building of the first railways in both countries. Great Britain was a developed country, with large industries throughout the land; a heavy traffic awaited more convenient means of transportation than could be afforded by the canal and the highway; and, in the building of the first railroads, the entire subject of location and construction was carefully investigated and supervised by Parliament. Money was cheap. The railroads were carefully and substantially built, and were certain to secure an abundant traffic.

In the United States, the situation was directly opposite. The country was unexplored; little was known of the conditions west of the Mississippi; and there were not more than ten million white inhabitants. Money was dear. There were few factories, and no assurance of traffic to support the railroads. There was no government direction in the location or construction of the railroads; consequently, no large plan was followed in their building. The courage of the individual, unsupported by the assurance of traffic, inaugurated the great system of railroads which to-day is unrivalled.

The average cost of all railways in the United Kingdom is $270,000 per mile. The average cost of all railroads in the United States is $64,000 per mile.

England developed her railroads; the United States was developed by the railroads.

The conditions have been reversed since 1830. The problem with the railroads to-day is not so much how to get more business as how to carry the existing traffic at low cost. Modern methods of construction were not applied in the original building of any of the railroads in the United States. They were built along the line of least resistance, without much regard to grade or curvature. The economic demands of modern traffic have required, upon the part of such railroads as the Pennsylvania, the Baltimore and Ohio, the Vanderbilt lines, the Harriman lines and other trunk lines, that they should expend enormous sums of money on improvements which are, in a large measure, merely corrective of original defects in location and construction which resulted from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

former methods and from enforced economy due to the high price of money and the uncertainty of earnings. The policy of the original constructors was to build as cheaply as possible. To cheapness of construction was sacrificed shortness of line and flatness of grade and curvature. This policy was, perhaps, the better one at the time it was adopted, because the country was sparsely settled, and the most sanguine failed to grasp the growth that was to follow. We must, therefore, keep in mind all the items of cost, from the very inception of the railroad to the present time, in an attempt to determine the whole cost; and even though we may be able to determine its cost in this careful manner, we may not be able to determine its value.

In its physical condition and in the quality of its service, the greater part of the mileage of our trunk-line systems equals, and in many respects excels, the railroads of Great Britain and the Continent. The rates of carriage for both passenger and freight are below the rates charged for similar service in any other country, and, at the same time, enormous dividends are paid; while in Great Britain, with rates of carriage considerably higher than here, the dividends paid are entirely unsatisfactory to the holders of the shares; and the last report of the railroads of Great Britain calls serious attention to the low net earnings of the railways and public carriers, and suggests that it may be necessary to advance the rates.

In Great Britain, no new work or general improvement can be carried out without the detailed plans and estimates of cost being first submitted to Parliament; and that body decides whether or not the work is to be done. If the proposed construction is authorized, an issue of fresh shares must be sold to provide money for the improvement. This system naturally increases the capital account of the railroads year by year, the theory being that the stockholder of to-day should not have his dividend diminished for improvements which are for the benefit of the stockholder of to-morrow. The net earning value of the improvements has evidently been overestimated, and the market value of shares is, on most English railways, constantly falling. In the United States, a considerable amount of development and many permanent improvements have been made from the earnings, and the stockholder has been compelled to await the time when, through the great development of the country, he may

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

receive dividends earned beyond the necessity for improvements and maintenance.

The expenditures called for by the 1907 orders (in the United States) for equipments alone is enormous. One road has ordered 6,700 freight-cars, exclusive of undelivered orders of last year's contracts; 110 passenger-cars, and 191 locomotives, besides 21 due from 1906 orders. Another railroad has ordered 150 locomotives, 4,000 forty-ton box-cars, and 1,000 fifty-ton steel cars. We do not know whether this equipment is to be charged to operating expenses or otherwise. The items are cited as an index of the enormous demand for increased equipment.

Generally speaking, the capital stock issue of the railroads of this country represents increment or appreciation, franchise value and good-will, as most of the railroads have been built from the sale of bonds; and it is only within the last few years that the common stock has been offered to the public for the purpose of making definite improvements or acquiring additional trackage or other facilities. The present value of the stock, therefore, represents the increased value of the property; and the problem seems to be to determine what percentage of this increment is due to the stockholders of the railroads, and what percentage is due to the State. There should be a fair division of this increased value. Since the existing stock is now in the hands of the public, however, and not in the possession of the railroad creating it, it seems difficult to consider any retroactive division of the increment. We should determine how the future increment will be shared between the railroad and the State, whose servant it is.

The work in Michigan was designed to fix a value upon the railroads of that State for the purpose of taxation. The value was divided into physical and franchise, or intangible, value, and the method of determining franchise value in that State was to capitalize the net earnings at five per cent. and add the amount to the estimated value of the property, obtained by adding item to item of the cost of reproduction. Under this system, if the net earning is $1,000 per mile, $20,000 is added to the value of the railroad for the purpose of taxation; and had this $1,000 been expended upon the property, thereby eliminating net earnings and creating physical value and increased efficiency, or if it had been absorbed in operating expenses, the railroad would have saved $19,000 per mile in its taxable value.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If the purpose of determining the physical and franchise value of the railroads within a State is to secure equal taxation on all property, treating all property on a common theory, it would appear that all corporations and business of every kind operating under the protection of patents, good-will, etc., should be assessed on physical and intangible value. The intangible, or use and occupancy, value of a railroad is similar to the patent, trade-mark or good-will value of a business. Many of the manufacturing industries charge a large amount of their capital issue to patents and good-will; and, indeed, in many cases, the costly factory would have small value for any other purpose than the specific one it was built to serve. The United States Steel Corporation might be selected as a notable example.

All business organizations and corporate companies, other than public utilities, are free to limit their productions, and are not compelled to operate at a loss in order to preserve their charter rights. In the case of a railroad or other public utility, however, certain service must be continuously given for the benefit of the public, whether this service is performed at a profit or at a loss to the corporation. It is fair to presume that neither the railroads, or public utilities, nor the private industries, or industrial corporations, would care to eliminate the intangible, patent, trade-mark or good-will value in estimating the total value of their respective properties, except, perhaps, for the purpose of taxation.

Since the railroad and other public utilities are common carriers and the servants of the people, and are subject to special police regulation which requires them to perform public services which, in some cases, are unprofitable, may not the value of a railroad be properly considered on a different theory from that applied to other property not operating under a similar charter?

The earning power of a railroad is gauged by the volume of business, the cost per ton or passenger mile and the fixed charges. The cost per train mile is approximately the same whether the train has a capacity of two hundred tons or four hundred tons. It is evident, therefore, that the earning capacity of a railroad which, by reason of its flat grades and easy curvature, can haul four hundred tons per train would be, on a given tonnage, nearly one hundred per cent. more than the earnings of another railroad which, with the same equipment and crew, could haul but two

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hundred tons per train. It will be frequently found that the road capable of carrying the greater tonnage, at smaller cost per ton mile, would cost much less to build than the road of smaller capacity costing more to construct, for the reason that the first-named road lies in easier country or has been located with greater skill. Assuming, however, that each road costs $50,000 per mile to build, one earns $2,000 per mile net, the other $1,000 per mile net. According to the Michigan theory, the first road would be taxed on a basis of $90,000 per mile, the second on a basis of $70,000 per mile. This scheme may work out fairly well for purposes of taxation, but the value of these two roads, viewed by an investor, would be in favor of the road earning $2,000 per mile, as it has the capacity of earning twice the dividends. It is, of course, difficult to insure accurate and equal accounting to determine the net earnings of a railroad, and the gross earnings cannot be considered as a measure of the value because of the difference in capacity to haul freight cheaply. The gross earnings of one road, by reason of the business carried, may be greater and its net earnings less than that of another railroad which, by reason of its location, organization, etc., is able to carry its business at a much smaller cost per ton per mile. If it were practicable to determine what the net earnings should be, it would be practicable to base one value of a railroad entirely upon its net earnings. Net earnings are properly declared after fixed charges and operating expenses are paid. In order to provide a check on the fixed charges, it seems necessary to fix upon a plan for determining the cost of the physical property of the railroad.

The independence of each State complicates many of the difficulties. One of the problems before the Michigan Commission was to determine the value of a railroad terminal as compared with the value of the road per mile outside the terminal. This question is difficult to determine even though the terminals and all the mileage lie within a single State; but, as is frequently the case, both terminals may lie without the State. The value of a railroad for the purpose of conducting traffic is its continuity of track, its physical condition, its terminals and general trackage, and its motive power and rolling-stock. Generally speaking, the oldest railroads have the largest terminal properties, and, as the country developed, these terminal properties became more and more valuable; and, in some cases, they became the most im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portant feature in the value of the railroads because, by reason of owning these large terminal properties, they were able to develop and furnish terminal facilities for new railroads seeking entrance to the cities in which the terminals were located. The value of these terminals to the old roads is often sufficient to offset the excessive cost of the original construction of the line between and the improvements which have followed.

There are cases where it would be economical for a railroad to abandon its line entirely and build through different territory between two large cities, thereby saving in operating cost for carrying the same tonnage between the same terminals. This saving in cost of operation, if capitalized at five per cent., would more than equal the cost of building a new line. Towns and industries, however, have grown up along the old line which must be served, and railroads are generally prohibited from acquiring parallel lines. Consequently, the higher cost of carrying between the terminals must continue; and, if a new organization constructs a line in the easier territory suggested, and secures satisfactory terminals, it is apparent that the traffic of the new company can be conducted at a smaller cost, providing, however, they can secure the tonnage. The securing of business depends not only on convenient terminals and efficient organization, but also upon the contract agreements the road has with other railroads which are in a position to give or withhold the business.

It seems to be generally conceded that many of the railroads of this country have abused their corporative privileges and that the State and Federal Governments should take supervision over their general conduct. There is danger, however, of unjust legislation if each State works independently. In some States, statutes have been enacted covering the control of some specific part of a railroad, such as the crossing of one railroad with another at grade, notably in Illinois, Ohio and Indiana. Under the new statutes in Indiana, a new railroad building through that State is compelled to pay all the cost of installing the grade crossing, together with the installation of a complete system of interlocking and signalling and its operation and maintenance forever. While this law was intended to protect traffic at grade crossings, it puts upon the junior road a very large expense.

The cost of a railroad is one thing. The value of a railroad may be measured in many different ways according to the neces-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sity for its continued operation. The investor gauges its value according to its ability to pay fixed charges and dividends. The State may measure its value on the broader lines of the greatest good to the greatest number, or it may narrow its view by considering its tax-producing appraisal. The town or village or industry which has had birth and life by reason of the railroads view its value from the point of view of local selfish interest; and so we find many meanings for the word "value" as applied to railroads.

If we take the broad view of its general usefulness we may question the propriety of placing a greater value on one part of a railroad than on another part or we may not say that one railroad is more valuable than another to the State; but rather that, since it is the continuity of track and the service rendered that make a railroad valuable, every foot of it is just as valuable as every other foot, regardless of the difference in cost between the various sections. After all, we may not be far wrong when we say that, since the ability to pay taxes and dividends depends upon the ability to earn, the true measure of value is its net earning.

The railroad has another value not directly measured by the standard of money—and that is, its value as one of the great promoters of temperance, industry and loyalty. The railway management long since uttered its ultimatum against the use of intoxicants, and to-day we find no more potent force for the promotion of temperance than the railroads. A man who drinks need not hope for employment on a railroad. There are no more loyal servants than the railroad commands. All of the various branches of the service are thoroughly organized and year by year are gleaning, from experience and study, the knowledge of how to secure the best results. The real working forces of our railroads are constantly alert to the necessity of vigilance and progress.

If any one doubts the earnestness and ability of the railroad forces let him attend a convention of the American Railway Association, the Maintenance of Way Association or the Master Car-Builders, Master Mechanics, or the Signal Associations. He will learn that day by day, for years, these men have worked on the solution of all the multifarious problems attendant upon the building, maintaining and operation of railroads. If the rail-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

roads were able and willing to work to their adopted standards, we would find the number of accidents greatly reduced.

The majority of railroad men would welcome State or Federal supervision of the railroads so that they might have the power of the law behind their specifications. Individual States have attempted radical legislation as a corrective of the evils by forcing a blanket rate for carrying passengers. This will not correct the trouble, nor is it even justice.

What we need is a safe and efficient railway system throughout the land, which will give impartial service. We need more railroad facilities. We need to know the method of issuing and placing the securities which form so large a part of our investments. We want the railroad to earn money enough to build, equip and operate according to the highest-class specifications which it is reasonable to impose under the various conditions. Can we not accomplish this by Federal supervision?

The first step should be to secure knowledge of actual conditions by a careful appraisal of the costs, the physical condition, the operating expenses, and the business available. While this appraisal is being made, chartered public accountants or Government examiners should prepare a statement of the accounts, covering, as far as possible, all the construction charges. Having ascertained the physical condition, we should compel the installation of the improvements necessary to bring each particular road up to the standard determined upon for its class.

Knowing all the conditions, we must sanction rates which will provide revenue sufficient to enable the roads to carry out the improvements we require. There should be Government inspection of the accounting, of the physical conditions and of the operating methods; and these inspectors should be shifted continually, so that no man might check his own work.

In order to accomplish this, it seems necessary to organize the several State Railroad Commissions into a national body, the chairman of which might properly be a Federal appointee. This national body could then formulate regulations which would insure uniform standards and could conduct all the work outlined without involving the question of State rights. All accidents could be investigated by the engineers of the several States and reported to the national body, thus insuring uniform action and avoiding large expense. The national organization could formu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

late and recommend legislation, so that we might have uniform laws to govern the railroads.

It is likely that this national body would be of such great importance to each State that the best men would be selected to serve upon it. By this means, the importance of the Railroad Commission of each State would be increased and the whole country would be benefited. The railroads would know exactly what was to be expected; and, while the road might be inter-State so far as boundary lines were concerned, its operation would be simplified by having the same conditions to meet in every State. We should avoid any attitude which would tend to throttle progress in any of the details of a railroad; we should govern in such manner as to invite capital to the building of much-needed facilities; and we should, and can, place a premium on the honest and able administration of every railroad.

CHARLES HANSEL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW THEOLOGY IN ENGLAND.

BY CHARLES JOHNSTON.

"And he said, So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; and should sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how."

I.—THE REV. R. J. CAMPBELL, THEOLOGIAN.

THERE are signs that we are in the midst of a religious awakening equal in power and promise to any in history, more impersonal than any in history. As the wind bloweth whither it listeth, so the wind of the Spirit is blowing on the hearts of men, kindling in them a new sense of reverence before the divinity of life. It is said that Luther once declared that in fifteen years there would be no Catholic Church. But, in reality, the Catholic Church owes as much to Luther as do the Protestant Churches and drew from the religious upheaval of his day a new accession of spiritual force and purity. In like manner, one might have thought, a generation ago, when the tide of Darwinism was in full flood, that in fifteen years there would be no more Christian belief. Just the opposite result has come from Darwin's teaching—as was inevitable, seeing that it contains so much spiritual truth. Christian belief, purified by the touch with nature's forces, has burst forth into new life and growth which is already transforming the thought of the world, and with it the Christian Churches.

The tides of thought set in motion by Darwin are washing away the incrustations of centuries. It may seem strange, but it is true, that one result of Darwin's work is to bring us closer to the teaching of Jesus; less strange, perhaps, if we remember that Jesus was full of the sense of the growing forces of nature, drawing thence all his images of spiritual life, and teaching evolution in a far wider sense than Darwin. The appeal to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

experience, the return to nature, must bring us closer to the thought and feeling of Jesus. So it is natural, while it is also wonderful, that the great recent growth in knowledge should bring out the teaching of Jesus with fresh lustre and power.

Darwin studied natural life with reverence, courage, intuition and faith. The movement which we may call the New Theology studies all life, natural and spiritual, in the same spirit. And, just as many others were feeling their way to the teaching of evolution at the same time as Darwin, so many hearts in many countries are awakening to-day to the new spiritual light. One of the most forceful and eloquent prophets of the new views in England is Mr. R. J. Campbell, who has succeeded Dr. Parker, as minister of the City Temple. His recent book, "The New Theology," has been made the subject of scores of sermons, in praise or blame. An American edition has brought it within the reach of readers in this country. I shall try to give some account of its thought, as far as possible, in the writer's own words.

The New Theology is essentially Christian, in the fullest sense. It holds that the religious experience which came to the world in Jesus can supply all needs, and only requires to be freed from limiting statements in order to lay firm hold once more upon the civilized world. The New Theology is an untrammelled return to the Christian sources in the light of modern thought. Its starting-point is a re-emphasis of the Christian belief in the divine immanence in the universe and in mankind. The New Theology holds that we know nothing and can know nothing of the Infinite Cause whence all things proceed except as we read Him in His universe and in our own souls. It is the immanent God with whom we have to do; and, if this fact is once fully grasped, it will simplify all religious conceptions and give a working faith.

The word "God" stands for many things; but, in the thought of the movement we are considering, it stands for the uncaused Cause of all existence, the unitary principle implied in all multiplicity. Every one of necessity believes in this infinite unity. The finite universe is one means to the self-realization of the infinite. Supposing God to be the infinite consciousness, there are still possibilities for that consciousness which it can only know

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as it becomes limited. Those to whom this thought is unfamiliar have only to look at their own experience to see how reasonable it is. You may know yourself to be a brave man, but you will know it in a higher way if you are a soldier facing the cannon's mouth; you will know it in a still different way if you have to face the hostility and prejudice of a whole community for standing by something which you believe to be right. It is one thing to know that you are a lover of truth; it is another thing to realize it when your immediate interest and your immediate safety would bid you hedge and lie. These facts of human nature may tell us something about God. To all eternity God is what He is and never can be other, but it will take Him to all eternity to live out all that He is. In order to manifest the possibilities of His being, God must limit that being. There is no other way in which the fullest self-realization can be attained. No part of the universe has value in and for itself alone; it has value only as it expresses God. To see one form break up and another take its place is no calamity, however terrible it may seem, for it only means that the life contained in that form has gone back to the universal life, and will express itself again in some higher and better form. To think of God in this way is an inspiration and a help in the doing of the humblest tasks. It redeems life from the dominion of the sordid and the commonplace. It supplies an incentive to endeavor, and fills the heart with hope and confidence. To put it in homely, every-day phraseology, God is getting at something and we must help Him. We must be His eyes and hands and feet; we must be laborers together with Him. This fits in with what science has to say about the very constitution of the universe; it is all of a piece; there are no gaps anywhere. It is a divine experiment without risk of failure, and we must interpret it in terms of our own highest.

It follows from what has already been said that we know nothing and can know nothing of God except as we read Him in the universe, and we can only interpret the universe in terms of our own consciousness. In other words, man is a microcosm of the universe. What the universe may be, we do not know. We can only know it in so far as it produces images in our minds, and enters into our individual consciousness. The New Theology starts with the assumption that the universe is God's thought about Himself, and that "in so far as I am able to think it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

along with Him, 'I and my Father (even metaphysically speaking) are one.'" The so-called material world is our consciousness of reality exercising itself along a strictly limited plane. We can know just as much as we are constituted to know, and no more. But it is all a question of consciousness. The larger and fuller a consciousness becomes, the more it can grasp and hold of the consciousness of God, the fundamental reality of our being as of everything else.

We have an opening into larger fields of consciousness in our knowledge of what is called the subconscious mind, or the subliminal consciousness. Our discovery of its existence has taught us that our ordinary consciousness is but a small corner of our larger consciousness. It has been well compared to an island in the Pacific, which is really the summit of a mountain whose base is miles below the surface. Summit and base are one, and yet no one realizes when standing on the little island that he is perched at the very top of a mountain peak. So it is with our every-day consciousness of ourselves; we find it difficult to realize that this consciousness is not all there is of us. But when we come to examine the facts, the conclusion is irresistible, that of our truer, deeper being we are ordinarily quite unconscious. Beyond the ordinary self, whom we are familiar with, there is a larger self, vastly greater than we know. This larger self is, in all probability, a perfect and eternal spiritual being integral to the being of God. The surface self is the incarnation of some portion of that true eternal self which is one with God.

Another inference from our knowledge of the subconscious mind is that of the fundamental unity of the whole human race. Ultimately your being and mine are one, and we shall come to know it. Individuality only has meaning in relation to the whole, and individual consciousness can only be fulfilled by expanding until it embraces the whole. Nothing that exists in our consciousness now and constitutes our self-knowledge will ever be obliterated or ever can be, but in a higher state of existence we shall realize it to be a part of the universal stock. "I shall not cease to be I, nor you to be you; but there must be a region of experience where we shall find that you and I are one."

A third inference, already implied in all that has gone before, is that the highest of all selves, the ultimate Self of the universe, is God. The New Testament speaks of man as body, soul and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spirit. The body is the thought form through which the individuality finds expression on our present limited plane; the soul is a man's consciousness of himself as apart from all the rest of existence and even from God—it is the bay seeing itself as the bay and not as the ocean; the spirit is the true being thus limited and expressed—it is the deathless divine within us. The soul, therefore, is what we make it; the spirit we can neither make nor mar, for it is at once our being and God's. "God is my deeper Self and yours, too; He is the Self of the universe and knows all about it." He is never baffled and cannot be baffled; the whole cosmic process is one long incarnation and uprising of the being of God from itself to itself. The being of God is a complex unity, containing within itself and harmonizing every form of self-consciousness that can possibly exist. No one need be afraid that in believing this he is assenting to the final obliteration of his own personality. No form of self-consciousness can ever perish. It completes itself in becoming infinite, but it cannot be destroyed.

We come now to the personality of Jesus. In the view of the New Theology, the character of Jesus represents the highest standard for human attainment; it is an ideal already manifested in history. If the life of Jesus was lived consistently, from first to last, with perfect love, directed toward impersonal ends, in such a way as to be and do the utmost for the whole, what can we call it except divine? We should restrict the word "divine" to the kind of consciousness which knows itself to be, and rejoices to be, the expression of a love which is a consistent self-giving to the universal life. Jesus was divine because his life was governed wholly by this principle.

In Jesus, humanity was divinity, and divinity humanity. Christendom recognizes the life of Jesus as the standard of human excellence. But this is not to say that we shall never reach that standard too. Quite the contrary. We must reach it, in order to fulfil our destiny and to crown and complete the work of Jesus. Traditional orthodoxy would restrict the description, "God manifest in the flesh," to Jesus alone. The New Theology would extend it in a lesser degree to all humanity, and would maintain that, in the end, it will be as true of every individual soul as ever it was of Jesus: "as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one of us. . . . I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in them and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one."

The reason why the name of Jesus has such power in the world to-day is because a perfectly noble and unselfish life was crowned by a perfectly sacrificial death. The life and death together were a perfect self-offering, the offering of the unit to the whole, the individual to the race, the Son to the Father, "and, therefore, the greatest manifestation of the innermost of God that has ever been made to the world." In this self-offering was the perfect manifestation of the eternal Christ, the humanity which reveals the innermost of God, the humanity which is love. To partake of the benefits of that Atonement, we have to unite ourselves to it; "to die to self with Christ, and rise with Him into the experience of larger, fuller life, the life eternal."

While the resurrection is a symbol, the New Theology holds that it is also a fact, taking its stand on broad ground that, without a belief in a resurrection, Christianity could not have made a start at all. The disciples must have become convinced that they had seen Jesus face to face, after the world believed Him to be dead and buried. How are we to account for this confidence of theirs that they had once more looked upon the face of Jesus?

In the view of Mr. Campbell, insistence upon the impossibility of a physical resurrection presumes an essential distinction between spirit and matter, which he cannot admit. The philosophy underlying the New Theology may be called a monistic idealism, and monistic idealism recognizes no fundamental distinction between matter and spirit. The fundamental reality is consciousness. The so-called material world is the product of consciousness exercising itself along a certain limited plane; the next stage of consciousness above this is not an absolute break with it, although it is an expansion of experience or a readjustment of focus. "Admitting that individual consciousness persists beyond the change called death, it only means that such consciousness is being exercised along another plane; from a three-dimensional, it has entered a four-dimensional, world. This new world is no less and no more material than the present; it is all a question of the range of consciousness. . . . Does this throw any light upon the mysterious appearances and disappearances of the body of Jesus? . . . Here we have a being, whose consciousness belongs to the fourth-dimensional plane, adjusting Himself to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the capacity of those on a three-dimensional plane for the sake of proving beyond dispute that—

'Life is ever lord of death,
And love can never lose its own.'

This seems to me the most reasonable explanation of the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus, and the impression produced by them on the minds of His disciples."

So far, the views of this eloquent preacher on the main points of Christian teaching. I have used his own words as far as possible throughout, inserting marks of quotation where misunderstanding might arise from the use of the first person. It must be held in mind that Mr. Campbell addresses himself with persuasive reasonableness to the many doubts and objections which his views cannot fail to arouse. To do full justice to his thought and method, readers must go to his book.

II.—SIR OLIVER LODGE, SCIENTIST.

Theology has gone thus far toward an understanding and reconciliation with the modern philosophic spirit. Let us see what science, the other pole of organized thought, has to say of the same high problems. It would, of course, have been conceivable that the new forces of knowledge should profoundly affect theology, but that, at the same time, students of science should restrict themselves to the study of natural phenomena, and hold aloof from all religious themes. They have not done so, however. One of the most eminent men of science, Sir Oliver Lodge, has devoted years of thought and study to these very questions, viewed in the light of scientific knowledge. Let me try to give some account of his conclusions, as stated in his recent book, "The Substance of Faith," once more using his own words as far as possible.

In the view of Sir Oliver Lodge, the law of the Universe, and the will of God are to be regarded as in some sort synonymous terms. It is impossible properly to define such a term as "God," but it is permissible reverently to use the term for a mode of regarding the Universe as invested with what in human beings we call personality, consciousness and other forms of intelligence, emotion and will. These attributes, undoubtedly possessed by a part, are not to be denied to the whole, however little we may be able as yet to form a clear conception of their larger meaning.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We are a part of the Universe, and the Universe is a part of God. Even we also, therefore, have a Divine Nature and may truly be called sons and co-workers with God.

The process of evolution can be regarded as the gradual unfolding of the Divine Thought, or *Logos,* throughout the universe, by the action of Spirit upon matter. Achievement seems as if irradiated by a certain happiness: and thus a poet like Browning is led to speak of the Divine Being as renewing his ancient creative rapture in the processes of nature: joying in the sunbeams basking upon sand, sharing the pleasures of the wild life in the creatures of the woods,

> "Where dwells enjoyment there is He;"

and so to conjecture that

> "God tastes an infinite joy
> In infinite ways—one everlasting bliss
> From whom all being emanates, all power
> Proceeds; in whom is life for evermore."

The Intelligence which guides things is not something external to the scheme, clumsily interfering with it by muscular action, as we are constrained to do, when we interfere at all; but is something within and inseparable from it, as human thought is within and inseparable from the action of our brains. In some partially similar way we conceive that the multifarious processes in nature, with neither the origin nor maintenance of which we have had anything to do, must be guided and controlled by some Thought and Purpose, immanent in everything, but revealed only to those with sufficiently awakened perceptions. To the highest members of our race, the Intelligence and Purpose, underlying the whole mystery of existence, elaborating the details of evolution, are clearly visible.

The double nature of man,—the inherited animal tendencies and the inspired spiritual aspirations,—if they can both be fully admitted, reconcile many difficulties. Our body is an individual collocation of cells, which began to form and grow together at a certain date, and will presently be dispersed; but the constructing and dominating reality called our "soul" did not then begin to exist, nor will it cease with bodily decay. Interaction with the material world then began, and will then cease, but we ourselves in essence are persistent and immortal. Even our personality

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and individuality may be persistent, if our character be sufficiently developed to possess a reality of its own. In our present state, truly, the memory of our past is imperfect or non-existent; but, when we waken and shake off the tenement of matter, our memory and consciousness may enlarge too, as we rejoin the larger self of which only a part is now manifested in mortal flesh.

The ancient doctrine of a previous state of existence, of which we are now entranced into forgetfulness, is inculcated in the well-known lines of Wordsworth's "Ode":

> "Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting:
> The Soul that rises with us, our life's star,
> Hath had elsewhere its setting,
> And cometh from afar:
> Not in entire forgetfulness,
> And not in utter nakedness,
> But trailing clouds of glory do we come
> From God, who is our home."

The idea of gradual incarnation—growing as the brain and body grow, but never attaining any approach to completeness even in the greatest of men—sets one above innumerable petty difficulties, and seems an opening in the direction of the truth. On this view, the portion of the larger self incarnated in an infant or a feeble-minded person is but small: in normal cases, more appears as the body is fitted to receive it. In some cases, much appears, thus constituting a great man; while in others, again, a link of occasional communication is left open between the part and the whole—producing what we call "genius." Second childishness is the gradual abandonment of the material vehicle, as it gets worn out or damaged. But, during the episode of this life, man is never a complete self, his roots are in another order of being, he is moving about in worlds not realized, he is as if walking in a vain shadow and disquieting himself in vain.

As to the question whether we ever again live on earth, it appears unlikely on this view that a given developed individual will appear again in unmodified form. If my present self is a fraction of a larger self, some other fraction of that larger self may readily be thought of as arriving,—to gain practical experience in the world of matter, and to return with developed character to the whole whence it sprang. And this operation may be repeated frequently; but these hypothetical fractional appearances can hardly be spoken of as reincarnations. We must not dogma-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tize, however, on the subject, and the case of the multitudes at present thwarted and returned at infancy may demand separate treatment.

The idea of Redemption or Regeneration, in its highest and most Christian form, is applicable to both soul and body. The life of Christ shows us that the whole man can be regenerated as he stands; that we have not to wait for a future state, that the Kingdom of Heaven is in our midst and may be assimilated by us here and now. The term "salvation" should not be limited to the soul, but should apply to the whole man. What kind of transfiguration may be possible, *or may have been possible,* in the case of a perfectly emancipated and glorified body we do not yet know.

The most essential element in Christianity is its conception of a human God; of a God, in the first place, not apart from the Universe, not outside it and distinct from it, but immanent in it; yet not immanent only, but actually incarnate, incarnate in it and revealed in the Incarnation. The nature of God is displayed in part by everything, to those who have eyes to see; but it is displayed most clearly and fully by the highest type of existence, the highest experience to which the process of evolution has so far opened our senses. The Humanity of God, the Divinity of man, is the essence of the Christian revelation.

Here is the central thought of Sir Oliver Lodge, speaking as a representative of the foremost science of our time. One cannot fail to see that, point by point, he is teaching the same doctrine as Mr. Campbell: the immanent God; the personal self as only a fragment of the higher self; the higher self as a link, a stepping-stone to the divine consciousness; the incarnation of Jesus, His life and death, as revelations of divine consciousness, and therefore a prophecy of that future when "we shall be like Him in glory." The thoughts, the very words, are the same. Not that either borrows from the other; but the same Spirit is blowing on the hearts of both, telling of a new awakening of the religious life of mankind.

CHARLES JOHNSTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHARLES ANDERSON DANA.

BY MAYO W. HAZELTINE.

It is, from many points of view, an admirable piece of biography that is presented in a volume of some 550 pages, "The Life of Charles A. Dana," by James Harrison Wilson, LL.D., late Major-General U.S.V. (Harpers). The author met the subject of the book in the spring of 1863, during the operations against Vicksburg; and he served with him in the field during three of the most memorable campaigns of the Civil War. As a bureau officer of the War Department, General Wilson subsequently served under him for a short period, when Mr. Dana was Assistant Secretary of War. The two became close personal friends, and their intimacy remained unbroken up to Mr. Dana's death in October, 1897. Under the circumstances, the biographer was peculiarly well fitted to depict the first fifty years of his subject's life, and to describe the remarkable, if not unique, qualifications of his friend for the task upon which he entered early in 1868, when he assumed the editorship of the New York "Sun." If the book be open to criticism on any score, it is, perhaps, on this, that a great majority of readers might have liked to see a larger proportion of the space at the author's disposal devoted to the three decades during which Mr. Dana made a deep and lasting impression on his contemporaries, and his use of which in the development of a great newspaper constitutes his best title to remembrance. It is the last thirty years of his life to which, within the brief compass of this notice, we shall largely confine ourselves, after a cursory survey of the preceding many-sided experiences by means of which Charles A. Dana was so thoroughly equipped for the function of Editor-in-Chief.

I.

Born in 1819 at Hinsdale, a small town in Western New Hamp-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shire, Charles Anderson Dana was the descendant of a family which for six generations had been settled in New England. If we except an attenuated stream of Italian influence, derived from an ancestor of the first settler, the Dana family was of absolutely pure New England blood, which partly accounts, as the biographer suggests, for the fact that Mr. Dana all his life was one of the most stalwart believers in the American people, and one of the most devoted partisans of American institutions that the country has produced. For the self-reliance which was to form a distinctive element of his character, he was, doubtless, indebted in part to the circumstance that, after he entered his twelfth year, he had to be self-supporting, and to begin the process of self-education which he pursued until the end of his life. While still a youth, he taught himself Latin, Greek and German; and it was almost exclusively through his own exertions that he fitted himself to matriculate without conditions in 1839 at Harvard College, from which institution he ultimately received the degree of Bachelor of Arts, as of the class of 1843. He maintained himself for some two years at college, partly by school-teaching, and partly by newspaper writing; but, in the autumn of 1841, he joined the Brook Farm Association, which represented an honest and conscientious effort to combine cooperative labor with democratic living and intellectual improvement.

Here he remained until the summer of 1846, when he removed to New York, where he presently secured from Horace Greeley, whose acquaintance he had made five years before, employment as City Editor of the "Tribune." He remained attached to that paper as City Editor, European Correspondent, Managing Editor and Chief-of-staff, or First-Assistant Editor, until March, 1862, when he found further association with Greeley impracticable, and tendered to the trustees of the "Tribune" his resignation, which by them was reluctantly accepted. His literary activity had not been by any means confined to the columns of the "Tribune"; for in 1854 he had found time to edit "Putnam's Monthly," and in 1857 had brought out the "Household Book of Poetry," which has gone through many editions, and is still looked upon as one of the best collections, if not the very best, of the kind published in the English language. With his old Brook Farm friend, George Ripley, he entered in 1858 on the preparation of "The American Cyclopædia," the last volume of which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was completed in 1863. His receipts from the copyright on these works, his dividends from the shares in the "Tribune," of which he had become an owner, and his salary, which gradually had been raised to $50 a week, enabled him and his family to live in comfort till the outbreak of the war between the States.

Immediately after terminating his connection with the "Tribune," he became associated with the War Office, where he maintained the most confidential relations to Lincoln and Stanton, and at more than one critical conjuncture was known as "the eyes of the Government at the front." Resigning the post of Assistant Secretary of War in July, 1865, he went to Chicago for the purpose of becoming editor of the "Daily Republican." He made the "Republican" a brilliant, able and interesting newspaper; but, as the promised capital of half a million dollars was not forthcoming, he decided, after a year of struggle and disappointment, to give up the enterprise, and buy or found a newspaper in New York. Late in December, 1867, or early in January, 1868, he closed the contract for the control of the New York "Sun," to which paper was to be given the fruitful remainder of his life.

II.

Summary as is this catalogue of the principal events in that part of Charles A. Dana's life which preceded his acquisition of the "Sun," it cannot have failed to demonstrate that no man, European or American, ever came to the editorship of a high-aiming journal so qualified by wide and ripe experience, and by diversified attainments. He knew his own country, North and South, East and West, as few have known it; he had learned to know Europe as an eye-witness of the fateful scenes of 1848; he knew books; he was proficient in a dozen languages and literatures; he was thoroughly conversant with public affairs not only as an observer and as a commentator, but as an actor; he had held for years a high and onerous post in the Federal administration, and he had made the intimate acquaintance of a multitude of public men in military and civil life. Above all, he knew the newspaper business with absolute completeness; its methods, its limitations, its purposes, its aspirations and its possibilities. He had come to be, in fine, an incomparable repository of knowledge, which was to be applied by him to the criticism of public affairs, with a wisdom acknowledged by impartial onlookers, and with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a benignity, a generosity and an acute sense of justice which only those nearest to him could at the time thoroughly appreciate, but which history will recognize.

As we pointed out at the time of his death, there has never lived in the United States a more genuine American than was Charles A. Dana. Never has our Commonwealth possessed a citizen more deeply impregnated by birth and education with the spirit of our institutions, or more thoroughly and fruitfully conversant with their workings and their transformations during the nineteenth century. From this point of view he has been at times compared with Horace Greeley. It is certain, however, that his mental training, in adolescence and early manhood, was much more broad, rigorous and stimulating, and that his stores of knowledge were far ampler and more various than were those of the elder journalist. Yet Greeley himself was not more purely and unmistakably a product of this country, of its traditions and of its atmosphere, than was Dana, whose stalwart and uncompromising Americanism was the outcome of ante-natal prepossessions, as well as of deep-rooted convictions and lifelong associations. Dana differed from Greeley, however, not only by virtue of a more virile temperament and much greater moral steadiness, but also in this significant particular that a far wider and more profound intellectual training had given him more unerring intuition, greater range of vision and of sympathy and a more powerful logical faculty. He had none of Greeley's premature self-confidence, and none of the latter's ill-timed irresolution after the die was cast.

We have seen that the habits and methods of application which Dana acquired at college gave him the instrument of self-instruction, but we should add that, from that day to the close of his life, he found or made opportunities of study amid the incessant imperative duties of a most exacting calling. Without underrating the charm or the value of classical history and literature, he used his academical attainments to unlock the treasures handed down in those languages of modern Europe which are daughters of the Latin speech, and he used his mastery of his native Anglo-Saxon to obtain an intimate acquaintance, not only with the kindred German, but with the allied Scandinavian tongues. As regards the scope and thoroughness of his literary accomplishments, he has never had an equal in this country within his own

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

profession. Literature, however, represented only one side of his equipment. He was one of the few men who, despite the cares of business and the constant labors of an arduous profession, have been able to keep pace with the current of scientific research and speculation; with the biological, botanical, astronomical, dynamical and philosophical discoveries and tendencies of his own time. Nor should the fact be overlooked that, in a singularly prehensile and trustworthy memory, were garnered the products of long observation and reflection on political, historical, sociological and economical phenomena. In a word, it could be said of him with incomparably more truthfulness than it was said of Ferdinand Lassalle that he came to journalism armed with all the learning of his epoch.

III.

As we pointed out in some former comments on the subject of this biography, it is characteristic of a great editor, as of a veritable social philosopher, that there is no topic of human interest in which he does not feel a lively intellectual concern. "*Nihil humani a me alienum puto*"—"I count nothing alien to me that is human"—should be recognized as the index of his attitude and the inspiration of his work. To an abiding and a pervasive sense of human solidarity, however, the heart must contribute as well as the head. Only an instinctive sympathy and a personal experience of struggle and hardship can reveal to the moral nature the pathos and solemnity of the problems of man's existence. The essential conditions of such a revelation were not lacking, as we have seen, in the early life of Charles A Dana. Not ignorant of poverty, he knew how to commiserate the poor. Himself unpropped by any of the accidents of fortune, he longed to make his fellow workers independent of such accidents. That the wish should become a hope and a deliberate endeavor was, perhaps, to be expected from an ardent youth in the fifth decade of the nineteenth century, when the minds of men were rocked by the ground-swell of revolution, and when the watchers on the hilltops caught, as they thought, glimpses of a wider and more benignant social order. Rightly to interpret Mr. Dana's subsequent career as editor of "The Sun," adequately to appreciate the sympathetic as well as the dynamic aspect of his character, one should not lose sight of the circumstance chronicled above, to wit, his entrance at the age of twenty-three into that band of wistful

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reformers of society, whose Brook Farm experiment was a failure more illustrious than many a brilliant self-seeking success. It is also noteworthy that his first newspaper training was obtained in association with the "Harbinger," a journal avowedly devoted to social renovation. The imprint made upon the plastic fibre of his young manhood by such aspirations and experiences was never effaced. The influence of a youthful, but sincere and fervent, effort at the amelioration of social conditions ran like a silver streak, unchecked by the less sanguine hopes and the sobered convictions of riper years, through more than half a century of journalistic work. Hence it came to pass that, through the fifteen years of his association with the "Tribune" and the twenty-nine years of his control over "The Sun," Mr. Dana never shut his columns to the dreams and the proposals of any honest devotee to the improvement of society. He never denied to social reformers, what they vainly may have sought in many quarters, a forum of free discussion. An audience he never refused, though approval he might withhold. His reason may have forbidden him to countersign their arguments, but his heart told him that their aims at least were right.

The time has come to say that the magnitude of the services which Mr. Dana rendered to the "New York Tribune," considered as an organ of popular education, has never been appreciated. He himself was never known to allude to the self-effacement which obscured the volume and the value of his contributions to that newspaper. He seemed to have the kind of pride which shrinks even from the semblance of self-vindication, and which feels too firm a confidence in the power of future accomplishment to care to rehearse the past. Yet it is no secret to those familiar with the inner history of that journal that the extraordinary circulation and influence attained by it during the decade preceding the Civil War was largely, if not mainly, due to the development of Mr. Dana's aptitude for his vocation. So far as the "Tribune" became anything outside of a political newspaper—and it did, in fact, become something far more comprehensive, elevated and powerful than the mere advocate of political opinions—it was he, rather than Horace Greeley, who created it. The latter, indeed, was primarily, and would have been, if left to himself, exclusively, a writer of political leading articles. It was not Greeley, but his many-sided young coadjutor, who took

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all learning for his province, and made the "Tribune" for a time a fountain of enlightenment and stimulation to the whole people of the North. There is also reason to believe that, even in politics, at more than one grave crisis, when Greeley's own faith faltered and his purpose swerved, he leaned for guidance and support on his more resolute co-worker. On the date of the passage of the Nebraska bill, for instance, Greeley almost despaired of the Republic, and it was Mr. Dana's hand that seized the "Tribune's" helm, and made it an irresistible promoter of the creation and the triumph of the Republican Party. Again, at the outbreak of the Rebellion, Greeley's heart sank, and his mind fluttered, and, refusing to heed the counsel of his undismayed associate, he caused the paper, which had made Lincoln's election possible, to become, in the eyes of the new President, an object of aversion and distrust.

There is no doubt that Mr. Dana's withdrawal from the "Tribune," which took place at this juncture, and his acceptance soon afterward of the office of Assistant Secretary of War, opened one of the most interesting chapters of his rich experience. The present biographer has well brought out how Dana, as the eye and right hand of Stanton at the front, watched and manipulated the mainsprings and driving-wheels of the stupendous machinery of war which had for its field a continent and for its aim the restoration of a dismembered empire. At the front, Dana was in a position to see victories in embryo and great commanders in the germ. His intuitive judgment of abilities and character, derived partly from nature, and partly from the practice of a profession which requires the power of instantaneous appraisement, he put at the service of his country on more than one unrecognized but critical occasion. Incompetence he punished with Roman ruthlessness; but many a gallant soldier he rescued from unmerited disgrace and showed him how he might pluck honor out of the jaws of disesteem. It is an indisputable fact, though he never asked nor received credit for it, that to Charles A. Dana more than to any other man was due the failure of the intrigue organized against Grant by McClernand during the siege of Vicksburg. Dana knew Grant and believed in him, and the Assistant Secretary's word had weight with Stanton. It is hard to recall another instance in modern history where the gift of judging men correctly has had more momentous con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sequences. Of course, however, the range and value of Mr. Dana's work at the War Office are but faintly indicated by the effect of his divination of the skill and promise of commanders. Unnoticed but indispensable went on the ceaseless organization of fresh forces to fill the gaps created by battle and disease; the preparation and forwarding of arms, ammunition and supplies; in a word, the myriad labors which make up the secret process of forging the thunderbolts of war. In all these functions Mr. Dana played an unwearied and inestimable part.

IV.

We have noted above that, after Lee's surrender had made the War Department by comparison a sinecure, Mr. Dana accepted the invitation of the owners of the Chicago "Republican" to become its editor. That this journal failed was owing to causes entirely beyond his control. The occasion which was to tax his powers to the utmost came a little later. He had for the first time an opportunity of carrying out fully and permanently his ideas of a newspaper's possibilities and of newspaper rewards, when, at the end of the year 1867, he organized the company which bought "The Sun." Once free to embody his view of the aims and standards of journalistic work, Mr. Dana produced a newspaper which in this country had then no parallel in respect of keenness, comprehensiveness and trustworthiness of observation; breadth and accuracy of knowledge; luminous and fruitful scholarship; soundness of reasoning and matured good sense. He justified the title of his journal, for in it he offered a daily conspectus of all that meets the solar rays. For the first time it might be said of an American editor that, while graduating the space allotted to each subject by its relative importance, he did in very truth obey the dictum of Dr. Johnson, and survey mankind from China to Peru. His conception of news and editorial comment differed widely from that of preceding editors. He believed that, not only as regards local incidents and local politics, but as regards the personages, events, movements, discoveries and discussions of the world at large, a great newspaper ought to be, not only the abstract and brief chronicle, but, we may add, the expounder of the time. Besides discharging its former news-gathering function, he thought that a daily journal should supplant the lecturer, supplement the pulpit and absorb the old-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fashioned magazine and quarterly review. Here, again, Mr. Dana stood forth as the author of an innovation of incalculable value. He may be said to have invented the cheapest and most useful instrument of popular education that the world has known. What he once had made of the "Weekly Tribune" he incomparably expanded and improved upon in the Sunday "Sun."

In the case of a man who thought for himself and had the courage of his opinions, it was inevitable that the grounds of his conclusions should sometimes be misapprehended, and his motives misconceived. Among the conjunctures when he suffered temporarily from such misinterpretation may be mentioned those when he did not hesitate to condemn Grant's administration, and to denounce the attempt of ill-advised friends of that President to give him a third term; when he castigated Hayes as the beneficiary of the fraud perpetrated on the American people by the Electoral Commission; when he declined to support the candidacy of Cleveland against Blaine; and when he repudiated the nomination of Bryan and the Democratic endorsement of the free coinage of silver at the ratio of sixteen to one. On every one of these occasions he was accused by ill-informed onlookers of acting from personal predilection or antipathy. Those who stood nearest to him and could best judge, however, can testify that, in every one of the instances cited, the conduct of his paper was shaped, not by prejudices, but by convictions, which he deemed it a supreme public duty to enforce. If there ever was an unselfish, a high-minded and a conscientious editor, who strove early and late to play the part of a patriot, that man was the creator of "The Sun." Thus it came to pass that, in the eyes of those who truly knew him, it was a position of unique distinction which Charles A. Dana ultimately occupied at the head of a fraternity of toilers to whom he had given unprecedented dignity and a limitless horizon. Having exhibited impressive proof of what he could do as an editor, he was, above most of his contemporaries, the man who should have been selected by wise citizens to serve the State in a legislative or an executive capacity. He would have had nothing to gain, however, by exchanging for a seat in the Federal Senate, or in the White House, a desk which, for prestige and influence, might well have been likened to a throne.

One of Mr. Dana's special titles to the remembrance of his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fellow workers in the newspaper calling is the fact that, more than any other man alive on either side of the Atlantic, he raised their vocation to a level with the legal and medical professions as regards the scale of remuneration. He honored his fellow craftsmen of the pen, and he compelled the world to honor them. Unforgotten, also, is his possession in a preeminent degree of the truly imperial faculty for choosing useful lieutenants. Almost he may be said to have founded a school of journalists. Certainly, he trained and left behind him a company of pupils and disciples, many of whose names are familiar, as, for example, those of Paul Dana, his son and successor in the editorship; William M. Laffan, the present owner of the paper; Edward P. Mitchell, long chief-of-staff and now the editor; Francis P. Church and Edward N. Kingsbury, the widely known editorial writers, and Chester A. Lord, for many years the managing editor. Two or three others still live to cherish and revere his memory. As, on the day of his funeral, those veterans beheld the body of their chief borne to its last resting-place, there may well have risen to their lips the Roman acclamation: Farewell, great Captain! Farewell, born Leader of Men! *Ave, Imperator, atque vale! Morituri te salutamus!*

MAYO W. HAZELTINE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PROBLEM OF CHILD IDLENESS.

BY THOMAS SPEED MOSBY, PARDON ATTORNEY OF MISSOURI.

THE solution of the child-labor problem, which, in view of the unanimity of public opinion upon the subject, may be regarded as practically assured, leaves still looming ominously beyond it the portentous problem of child idleness. Statistical information with regard to child-labor is abundantly at hand, and we know exactly the number of children employed in the factories of every State, their hours and their wages. But as to the number of children reared in idleness, we have, unfortunately, no other or better guides than the records of the reformatories and penitentiaries afford us.

These records indicate that the age of greatest criminality is somewhere between the ages of twenty and twenty-five, and that from sixty to seventy per cent. of felons are entirely unskilled in any trade or profession. The United States Census of 1890 showed that, of 52,894 convicts, 31,426 were ignorant of any kind of trade. French statistics covering a period of over fifty years reveal the following number of indictments per 100,000 of each of the classes named: Agriculture, 8; liberal professions and proprietors, 9; factory laborers, 14; commerce, 18; domestic service, 29; without regular trade or occupation, 405.

In the reformatories, where the prisoner by reason of his youth has had less time in which to acquire a trade, the percentage of the unskilled is necessarily much greater than in the penitentiaries. The writer had occasion to discuss this subject with the superintendent of an institution of this kind, which has upon its records the names of 3,154 boys whom it has received during a period of several years. The ages of the boys, at the periods of reception and discharge, ranged between ten and twenty-one years, thus covering the entire period between childhood and manhood.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"How many of these boys had ever been apprenticed before reaching your institution?" the superintendent was asked.

"None," was the reply.

"How many had knowledge of a trade?"

To the last question the very prompt and positive answer was this:

"Absolutely none; if they had, they would never have come here."

In the reformatory to which reference is here made every boy is taught a trade, and it is very seldom that one of them is again heard of as a violator of the laws.

In the largest penitentiary in the United States, where more than two thousand convicts are constantly confined, about sixty-five per cent. are without knowledge of any occupation when received. In some penitentiaries, the percentage is even greater. In this prison the factory system prevails, all are taught some trade, and only about fourteen per cent. ever return to crime.

All investigations in this country show, beyond question, that the American criminal is not a product of the trades, of the workshop or the factory. Although no trade or profession is immune from crime, we here find it at the minimum. And this is true of both sexes. The feminine delinquents are not recruited from the ranks of the factory girls. As a rule, they are women who do not care for work.

"Just as the twig is bent the tree's inclined." The child-idler is simply the adult-idler in the making. And, as Archbishop Tillotson quaintly said: "Idleness and luxury bring forth poverty and want; and this tempts men to injustice and that causeth enmity and animosity." The boy who is allowed to grow up unskilled in any occupation is the boy who is most likely to lapse into the state of mental, spiritual and physical stagnation which the author of the "Anatomy of Melancholy" has aptly characterized as "the nurse of naughtiness, the chief author of mischief, one of the seven deadly sins, the cushion upon which the devil chiefly reposes, and a great cause not only of melancholy, but of many other diseases"—and, he might well have said, of crime.

As has been shown, the age of greatest criminality follows immediately upon the age of legal maturity, and the class of greatest criminality is the non-working class. Bring a child to maturity without knowledge of useful work, and you place him in a class

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which statistics show is the most likely to commit crime, and at the age when most crimes are committed—thus assuring a kind of double probability of moral delinquency and industrial failure. Contrast such a case with that of the boy who has learned to make an honest living. Whether he be shoe-cutter, machinist, electrician, brass-moulder or what not, in all human probability he will continue to ply his trade. He will feel some sense of responsibility to his work. His mind will be occupied by the duties of his calling, and he will pass by the idle and the dissipated at a time when, as experience has shown, the human mind is most susceptible to the influences that make for crime. Nor is this a mere supposition. It is a fact verified by the prison records.

If the habits formed in youth may be regarded as in any sense an index or forecast of the character of the adult, then, in the light of the criminal statistics, the problem of child idleness may justly lay claim to some measure of the dignity and importance so freely accorded to the much-mooted problem of child-labor; and before making it impossible for the youth to acquire practical (as well as theoretical) knowledge of gainful pursuits, we should reckon the latent dangers that lurk within the possibilities of a generation brought up without effective knowledge of useful work.

To be sure, it by no means follows that, in teaching the child to work, his powers should be taxed beyond their capacity. To do so is inhuman in the extreme. The labor of the child should not proceed beyond the limits of healthful exertion; and the primary consideration, at all times, should be an educational and not a financial one. He should by no means be taught that the only object of labor is to earn money; but he should be made to understand his obligation to serve, inasmuch as he is served; to give, as he receives; to bring to the world, as he takes from it—and he should be taught the means of performing that obligation. With such an education he will be both able and willing to fashion with hand or brain, and he will go forth to his duties, feeling, not that the world owes him a living, but that he owes to the world a life.

THOMAS SPEED MOSBY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EPIC OF THE WEST'S EXPANSION.

BY CHARLES M. HARVEY.

LET us of these Oklahoma and Indian Territory admission days beware of laughing too loudly at Josiah Quincy's indignation in 1811, when somebody hinted to him the possibility that some time or another in the remote future there might be six States west of the Mississippi. Quincy was opposing Louisiana's admission because she was on the wrong side of that river. The proposition to admit Louisiana seemed to him to be monstrous. It was worse than monstrous; it was absurd. Congress had no authority, Quincy passionately declared, to throw the rights, the liberties and the property of the people of the United States "into hotch-pot with the wild men on the Missouri, or with the mixed, though more respectable, race of Anglo-Gallo-Americans who bask on the sands of the Mississippi."

We had fought eight years with the most powerful nation on the globe in order to establish our independence. Then we had set up an elaborate scheme of government to utilize the benefits we had gained. To dilute all these advantages by allowing a lot of semi-savage fur-traders, *voyageurs* and adventurers in the recently Franco-Spanish region west of the Mississippi to share in them involved an anticlimax which outraged Quincy's æsthetic sense even more than it assailed his ideas of political propriety.

But, as he viewed the situation, Quincy was right. His horizon, nailed down on the Alleghanies' crest, had a few loopholes in it through which he got stray glimpses of Ohio, Tennessee and Kentucky, but nothing farther onward. Benjamin Goodhue, a somewhat earlier Massachusetts Federalist, opposed any elaborate expenditure of labor or money in laying out the projected seat

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of government at Washington. The centre of population, which was east of Baltimore then, he argued, would be drawn farther east as settlements extended along the Atlantic. Washington, therefore, was too far west to be easy of access to the people. To the men of the Goodhue and Quincy period and temper, "Beyond the Mississippi" was as remote as "Beyond Thule" was to the contemporaries of Alexander of Macedon.

Wiser men, however, than Goodhue or Quincy also failed, and for excellent reasons, to foresee Oklahoma and Arizona as commonwealths which would share in the government of the country. In his first inaugural, Jefferson congratulated his fellow citizens on "possessing a chosen country with room enough for our descendants to the thousandth and thousandth generation." The country which Jefferson spoke of in such expansive language extended only to the Mississippi's east bank and was cut off from access to the Gulf of Mexico by Spain's Florida, which not only comprised our present State of that name, but included a strip along the southerly ends of Alabama and Mississippi, and Louisiana's easterly projection. And many of Jefferson's contemporaries said that his notions of his country's future growth and progress were wildly fantastic in their optimism. In this case, at least, Jefferson steered clear of that reproach which Fox attributed to Burke of being "wise too soon."

No American of a century ago could have foreseen the erection of Oklahoma, Arizona and their partners of to-day into Statehood, for there was no real West at that time. The Trans-Mississippi region is the West of to-day and to-morrow. Yesterday's West, stretching from the Alleghanies to the big river, was the parent of that of to-day, but this West is as unlike its forerunner as a son contributing to and sharing in the world's added experiences and improvements is apt to be unlike his father.

Nor did yesterday's West have a concrete existence when Jefferson went into office. It was in 1812 that the old West first revealed itself. The Federalists of that day called the second conflict with England "Mr. Madison's war." The country, however, knew it was Henry Clay's war. Clay, then Speaker of the House, coerced Madison into fighting England by making his renomination for President in 1812 contingent on his adoption of the war policy of the South and West.

Such social and political triumphs as the war contributed to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the country were won by the West. They were won by Harrison and his Ohioans and Kentuckians at the battle of the Thames, in Canada, where he defeated Proctor, the British commander, killed Tecumseh, the Shawnee, an immeasurably greater soldier than Proctor, and vanquished Tecumseh's red warriors, who were far more formidable fighters than any of Proctor's white troops. They were won by Jackson at New Orleans, where, with his Kentuckians, Tennesseeans and Lousianians, he overthrew Wellington's veterans at Chalmette. Those battles gave the United States nearly all the military glory which it gained in the land fighting of the war of 1812.

On the scale of that time, Jackson's inauguration in 1829 sent more people to Washington than went to see Roosevelt inducted into office in 1905, and the gathering was more miscellaneous. Said Justice Joseph Story: "All sorts of people were there, from the highest and most polished down to the most vulgar and gross in the nation. I never saw such a mixture. The reign of King Mob seemed triumphant." "It was the people's day," wrote Mrs. Samuel Harrison Smith, a chronicler of the time, "the people's President, and the people would rule."

Jackson's election was the West's first distinctive political triumph. The conservative East derided him when it first heard of his Presidential aspirations. To New England the idea of Old Hickory occupying the chair of Washington and Monroe seemed as fantastic as was the barbarian Maximin's succession to Alexander Severus as Emperor of Rome. Even the founder of his party was startled at the thought of his advent as head of the government. "I feel much alarmed at the prospect of seeing General Jackson President," said Jefferson to Webster in 1824.

Could the East have foreseen that three decades later a succession of Western men, unbroken save by the cases of Cleveland and Roosevelt, were to head the Government for half a century, it would have regarded Jackson's apparition as still more of a portent of peril. But, in the light of what Jackson revealed himself to be as President, the West had a right to say of him, in the language of Kipling's potter:

> "If I have taken the common clay
> And wrought it cunningly,
> In the shape of a god that was digged a clod,
> The greater honor to me."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The West's advent as a ruling force in the country's politics had an even larger influence on the Government's structure and subsequent history than did Adams's appointment of John Marshall to be head of the Supreme Court. Destitute as it was of all caste and class distinctions, the West's example abolished the property qualification for the suffrage which prevailed in the East at the outset. It placed poor and rich on the same level at the ballot-box. Created as they were by Congress, the Western States were nationalist from the beginning.

Physical causes also coincided to make the date of Jackson's advent of vast consequence to the West and the country. In 1811 the "New Orleans," built at Pittsburg by Fulton, Livingston and Nicholas J. Roosevelt (granduncle of the President), went down the Ohio and Mississippi and introduced steam on Western waters. The "General Pike," the first steamboat seen north of the mouth of the Ohio, tied up at the levee in St. Louis in 1817. In 1819 the "Independence" and the "Western Engineer" entered the Missouri's lower stretches. The "Virginia" steamed up the Mississippi in 1823, through the country of the Sacs and Foxes and Winnebagoes, to Fort Snelling, several decades before Minnesota had a local habitation or a name. On the rivers of the nearer and older West, steamboats were beginning to swarm in the year of Jackson's first election. That year saw the laying of the corner-stone in the construction of the Baltimore and Ohio, the earliest of the country's great railways, and thus witnessed the creation of a force which was destined to swing the country's population and industrial centre and the centre of its political and social gravity into the Mississippi valley.

"Europe stretches to the Alleghanies," says Emerson, "America is beyond." America began to assert herself about the end of the nineteenth century's first quarter. Jackson's advent was marked by a din like that which greets a new nation or a new millennium. He shook up parties, blotted out old political lines, and threw all his enemies—Democrats, National Republicans, Nullifiers, Anti-Masons and nondescripts—into the coalition which, in 1834, adopted the name of "Whigs." Old Hickory filled the stage as completely in his day as Young Hickory does in 1907. He dwarfed Clay, Webster, Calhoun, Van Buren and the rest of the leaders of both parties to the level of supernumer-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aries and superfluities. Personal government this was. It had no room in it for straddlers or negationists. Men could be neutral under Van Buren, Buchanan or McKinley, but everybody had to be either for or against Jackson.

The West furnished the country with issues—the Oregon controversy with England, Texas annexation, the Mexican war, the acquisition of New Mexico and California by conquest and purchase, and the struggle between the North and South for the possession of Kansas—from the days of the West's earliest President onward till the advent of the long line of Western Executives, which stretches, save for the Cleveland interregnum, from Lincoln's time to the accession of Roosevelt.

It was related at the time that Jackson urged his friend Sam Houston and his fellow Americans of Texas, who were in rebellion against Mexico, to retreat to the Sabine, and to bait Santa Anna into following them on to United States territory. This would give Jackson an opportunity to make war on Mexico, to annex Texas, as Houston and his followers wanted, and to extend the country's boundaries to the Rio Grande. Many persons believed the story. The Texans finished the war themselves, and did it at San Jacinto instead of retreating to the Sabine, but the essential part of the programme was carried out, though several years after Jackson had stepped down from office.

From St. Louis as a base, and with Independence and Westport Landing on the Missouri as starting-points, went Becknell, the Chouteaus, Glenn, Fowler and the other traders who opened the Santa Fé trail over which marched Kearny, Doniphan, Price and the rest of the Americans who carried their banners into the heart of Mexico in 1846, and participated with Taylor, Scott and Fremont in the conquest of New Mexico and California. "To-morrow," said Philip St. George Cooke, one of the officers of Kearny's expedition, in his diary, "three hundred wilderness-worn dragoons . . . set forth to conquer . . . a Pacific empire; to take a leap in the dark of a thousand miles of wild plains and mountains, only known in vague reports. Our success—we never doubt it—shall give us for boundary that world line of a mighty ocean's coast, . . . and shall girdle the earth with civilization." The atmosphere palpitated with the spirit of adventure.

In his last message to Congress, in 1848, Polk exultantly called the roll of the accessions of territory—Texas, Oregon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(the present States of Oregon, Washington and Idaho, and parts of Montana and Wyoming), New Mexico (the present New Mexico, all of Arizona except the strip below the Gila River, the States of Nevada and Utah, and parts of Colorado and Wyoming) and California—which had been made during his Presidency, and he proudly pointed out that, "the Mississippi, so lately the frontier of our country, is now only its centre." It was manifest destiny marching on.

On the West's and the country's development all this had a decisive influence. The tract covered by these various acquisitions was larger in area than Jefferson's Louisiana purchase from France in 1803. It fills a bigger space on the map than does the territory which Washington and George Rogers Clark extorted from George III in the treaty of Paris of 1783. Politically, moreover, the acquisition counted for more than it did in superficial measurement. It met the demands of physical geography in giving us a scientific frontier on the Gulf of Mexico and on the Pacific, removed all possibility of the planting of a new Mexico or a new Canada in the path of the westward march of American empire, and prepared the way for the Alaskan, Porto-Rican, Hawaiian and Philippine annexations, and for the social conquests which America has been winning in recent years.

While this rounding out in 1845-48 of the territory of the United States to its logical proportions was going on, things were taking place in the Old World—Ireland's potato famine of 1846, which started the exodus to America that is under way to this day, and the abortive rebellions of 1848 in Prussia, Austria, Saxony, Baden, Hungary and other countries in Central Europe, which have sent millions of immigrants to us for the liberty that they could not get in their home land—which were destined to assist materially in building up this new empire in the West.

These events attracted the earnest attention of the United States, especially of the West, which was soon to be profoundly and advantageously affected by them, and mass-meetings expressing sympathy with the German and Hungarian patriots were held in Cincinnati, St. Louis, Chicago and other towns in their section. In 1849, in his first annual message, that robust old Western campaigner, Zachary Taylor, told Congress that he deemed it to be his duty "to stand prepared, upon the contingency of the establishment by her of a permanent government,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be the first to welcome independent Hungary into the family of nations." No such favor for rebels against the authority of any great nation would be expressed by any President of the United States in our day.

Even before Polk's and Santa Anna's peacemakers at Guadalupe Hidalgo had, in the early weeks of 1848, fixed up the treaty which brought the war to an end and established our title to California and the rest of the territory won from Mexico, James W. Marshall made the gold discovery in the raceway of Sutter's mill, on the American fork of the Sacramento, which started an inrush from the four quarters of the globe that put California on the world's map. The American frontier had reached the Missouri by the opening of 1848. California's gold strikes, and the opening of Oregon to undisputed American settlement under the British treaty, swung the frontier as far westward in a single year as it had marched in the slow stages of the previous 240 years since Newport, Gosnold and Captain John Smith established at Jamestown the first permanent colony of English-speaking people ever planted in the New World.

With the West as a stage, events now came on with a rush. The South's desire to share in the new domain incited the repeal of the Missouri slavery prohibition compromise, which it accomplished in the Kansas-Nebraska Territorial organization bill that Douglas framed and Pierce signed in 1854. This started the struggle between North and South for the possession of Kansas, which convulsed the country.

> "We cross the prairies as of old
> The pilgrims crossed the sea,
> To make the West, as they the East,
> The homestead of the free.
> We go to rear a wall of men
> On Freedom's southern line,
> And plant beside the cotton-tree
> The rugged Northern pine."

These lines from Whittier's "Lays of the Emigrants," sung by the first colony of Free State men as they were leaving Boston for Kansas in July, 1854, showed the spirit of the settlers who were to fight the North's and liberty's battles on the Western plains. The Kansas contest killed the Whig party, and created the Republican party on the basic issue of preserving the Territories for freedom. The divergence between the Northern and the Southern elements of the Democracy in the later stages, 1858,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Kansas struggle split that party in the middle in the Charleston Convention of 1860, elected Lincoln, and this precipitated secession and civil war, out of which came emancipation, the negro issue, which is before the country still, and the new and more perfect Union of to-day.

Incidentally—and likewise coincidentally with some of the great events here enumerated—the Republican party passed a Free Homes law, signed by Lincoln in 1862, which attracted immigrants from all over the world, as it was intended to do, and added millions to the trans-Mississippi region's population. This and the war rendered necessary the trans-continental railroads, the first of which, begun in 1864, was finished in 1869, and four have been built since. To supply new lands when the fertile acres under Lincoln's law are exhausted, President Roosevelt induced Congress to pass the national irrigation act, applying wholly to the country west of the big river, to which he placed his signature in 1902.

As a resultant of the operation of all these forces there has been a population movement westward of epic largeness. The centre of the country's population, which was near Clarksburg, West Virginia, in 1840, just before the Texas, Oregon and California annexations, swung 55 miles westward by 1850; the California gold-diggings and the Oregon colonization sent in 88 miles farther between 1850 and 1860; the Free Homes law, the diffusion of railways through the West and the building of the transcontinental lines have kept the centre moving westward, its location in 1900 being near Columbus, in western Indiana.

From the Declaration of Independence till now, 25,500,000 immigrants have come to the United States, most of whom have settled in the West. All except 5,000,000 of these have come since Lincoln signed the Homestead Act. These, with the immigrants from the Eastern States, have written the West's prairies, deserts and mountains all over with human history. In the number of persons involved, and the number of miles traversed, this has been immeasurably the largest movement of people in any equal length of time in the annals of the globe. We are too near to it in time and distance to be able to throw it into the proper perspective, and to gauge its dimensions and significance. To describe its majesty and dramatic sweep would require a Gibbon or a Mommsen. In numerical proportion it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is a far greater population movement than that invasion of the Roman Empire by the Germanic tribes in the fifth century which altered the current of the world's history.

For Americans the compass pointed in only one direction—westward, always westward. Just before the annexation of Texas, Oregon and California, the West, to the popular fancy, had almost as many mysteries as peopled Central Africa in the days of Herodotus. Its old maps, with the Great American Desert flung across them from Missouri's and Iowa's westerly border to the Sierra Nevada and Cascade mountains, were about as vague as ancient Greece's maps with their margins of dragons and griffins.

As a political force, the Trans-Mississippi region had its beginning less than two-thirds of a century ago. Just previous to the accession of Texas, there were only three States—Louisiana, Arkansas and Missouri—west of the big river. With the admission of Oklahoma the number is twenty-one (to be increased to twenty-three eventually by the entrance of Arizona and New Mexico), as compared with twenty-six east of that stream. Moreover, Texas is allowed, under the admission act, to divide herself into four other States, if she wishes to do so. Probably she will never act upon the privilege. It is possible, however, in the concentration of population which the future may bring, that some of the other big Trans-Mississippi States may divide themselves, as Massachusetts long ago let Maine shift for herself, and as Congress cut Dakota Territory in two just before admitting both sections to Statehood. Out of Alaska's 600,000 square miles of territory, half the dimensions of the country east of the Mississippi, there may be four or five States carved in the coming time.

Of the contiguous part of the United States, sixty per cent. of the area is west of the river, and only twenty-eight per cent. of the population. The country's geographical centre, leaving out Alaska and our island possessions, is in Smith County in Northern Kansas. When Roosevelt's irrigation act abolishes the arid spaces, and the vast expanses of that locality fill up, the population proportion is likely to increase to 40 or 50 per cent. of the country's total. It may go beyond 50 per cent. when our trade with Asia's 800,000,000 people, half those of the entire globe, is developed, and when Seward's dream of half a century ago is realized of the Pacific as a highway of commerce thronged as much as the Atlantic.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That locality has the largest of all the States in area, which is one day to become the largest also in population. In population, it has the fifth and sixth States (Texas and Missouri), the fourth city (St. Louis), and the third largest export port (Galveston), which is soon likely to pass New Orleans and to stand next to New York. It already has 46 per cent. of the country's railway mileage of main track, 40 per cent. of the country's farms, 55 per cent. of its acres of improved land; it produces 20 per cent. of the country's manufactures, 16 per cent. of its coal, 99 per cent. of its gold and silver, and furnishes 60 per cent. of the country's aggregate exports. The centres of the country's production of wheat and oats are west of the Mississippi, the centre of the petroleum production has just jumped across that stream, and that of cotton production, now on the east bank, is likely to make the leap by 1910.

"West of the Rocky Mountains will be the big end of the United States within the lifetime of millions now with us," says James J. Hill, President of the Great Northern Railway. That prophecy looks forward to the time when Hill's own and his rivals' steamship lines of to-day on the Pacific will be as far surpassed in number, dimensions and speed as the Atlantic's crude Cunarders of 1840 are by the fleets of ocean greyhounds of 1907. Southwest and Northwest—localities in which until a few decades ago there "weren't no ten commandments," are filling up with settlers at a rate unknown in the past.

> "O you youths, Western youths,
> So impatient, full of action, full of manly pride and friendship,
> Plain I see you, Western youths, see you tramping with the foremost,
> Pioneers, O pioneers."

But the poet's words, applicable to the conditions of colonization days east of the big river, need revision to make them fit the present situation. The Trans-Mississippi's "pioneers" of 1907 are not "tramping" in or riding in prairie-schooners. Many of them are coming in palace-cars. The 33,000 rural postmen, traversing the 700,000 miles of delivery routes, most of them west of the river, carry newspapers and letters to the farmers' gates before the ink is fairly dry on them. The trolley-lines, the rural automobile routes, the rural circulating libraries and the long-distance telephones keep the pioneer of 1907 in close touch with the entire globe.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Irving points out that in many respects the plainsman astride of a horse must be a superior person to the man who treads laboriously through the forest, or who crouches in a canoe, as did the frontiersmen east of the river. This pre-eminence of locality sticks. To-day's West has larger horizons than yesterday's, offers greater opportunities, engages in more audacious enterprises, and has a more exuberant optimism. Its typical sons have much of the *insouciance* of Mark Twain's Nicodemus Dodge, printer.

That section blazes new paths in achievement. Beginning with Wyoming in 1869, that community, with Colorado, Idaho and Utah, have abolished all distinctions between women and men at the ballot-box in elections up to and including those for President. In the new State composed of Oklahoma and Indian Territory are 90,000 Cherokees, Choctaws, Chickasaws, Creeks and Seminoles, who dissolved, on March 4, 1906, the tribal organizations which have lasted since many centuries before Columbus, have diffused themselves in the mass of the country's citizenship, and will take their chances with the whites from this time onward in making and observing the country's laws.

The Mississippi's sunset side has had several Presidents of the Senate—Atchison of Missouri, Ingalls of Kansas and Manderson of Nebraska; one Speaker of the House—Henderson of Iowa; and more Cabinet officers than can easily be counted. It has had one Presidential candidate of a great party—Bryan of Nebraska—and his first canvass was the most exciting since Lincoln's election in 1860.

Here are a few of the West's distinctive contributions to the building of the United States:

It abolished the property qualification for the suffrage;

It levelled all divergencies between the sexes in the higher education;

In four of the Rocky Mountain States it made women and men equal at the polls;

Beginning with the Indian Territory in 1907, it has put the ballot in the red man's hand;

It made the Democratic party democratic;

It created the Republican party which has run the government for nearly half a century, except for two short interruptions, and gave the country Lincoln, Grant, the Shermans and many other of the great characters of the age;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1861-65 it killed State sovereignty, established nationalism, abolished slavery, and fashioned a "more perfect Union" than the fathers of the nation had devised;

By shutting out Spain, France, England and the rest of the world from the path of our advance sunsetward, it made America American.

If, as Petrarch says, "History is poetry freed from the incumbrance of verse," then the soul of the West must have been soaring and singing from the beginning. The region which sent Lewis and Clark through darkest America from the mouth of the Missouri to the mouth of the Columbia; which started Moses Austin from St. Louis to get from Ferdinand VII of Spain permission to colonize Texas; which produced Becknell and the rest of the Santa Fé overland traders, who were to Americanize much of New Mexico and some of old Mexico long before Zachary Taylor's guns resounded along the Rio Grande; which saw John Colter discover the marvels of the Yellowstone (and get laughed at when he told about them in St. Louis afterward); which was with Marcus Whitman and his fellow colonists moving through South Pass on their way to win Oregon for the United States; which rode with Kearny and Doniphan through Mexico to the Gulf and the Pacific; which stood with Fremont when he raised his flag of the star and the bear at Sonoma, at the beginning of the revolt, which placed California under the Stars and Stripes; which was present at the meeting of the rails of Oakes Ames' and Huntington's transcontinental lines at Promontory Point, in Utah; and which looked on remotely and impotently while Sitting Bull and Rain in the Face annihilated Custer and his army in the "Year of a Hundred Years"—has had poetry, melodrama and tragedy studded through its entire annals.

But have we at last reached the end of the romance of the West, of its grand passions? Hardly. Yesterday Josiah Quincy's "wild men on the Missouri" held an exposition to which all the world was bidden, and to which all the world came. Tomorrow, beginning with the Indian Territory and Oklahoma, the emancipated race of Geronimo, Crazy Snake and Red Cloud, reversing the defeats of King Philip, Pontiac and Tecumseh, will be sitting in the legislative halls at Washington helping to make laws for the continent which once they owned.

CHARLES M. HARVEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW CITIZENSHIP LAW.

BY GAILLARD HUNT, CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF CITIZENSHIP, DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

WHEN a future historian shall write an account of the achievements of this the most remarkable administration of our government since the Civil War, he will give prominent place to the naturalization law of a year ago and the citizenship law which was approved last March and is now becoming effective, for these two measures are the culmination of a hundred years of effort for reform and affect the very foundation of our political structure.

The first naturalization law, passed in 1789, was a failure in preventing frauds upon our citizenship which had sprung up even before the Constitution was adopted, and the numerous laws afterwards passed were all mere palliatives which never gave relief, because they did not reach the true cause of the evil, which was the lack of control by the national government over a national subject. In consequence, the frauds went on increasing until they had spread over the entire country, and in certain localities had become so extensive that they excited the gravest alarm on the part of thinking men. If our citizenship was to be trafficked in with impunity by corrupt courts and foreigners, it would only be a question of time when the whole electorate would be hopelessly debased. The new naturalization law has interfered not at all with the convenience of naturalization for honest men, but has established such an effective system of national supervision of naturalizing courts that extensive fraudulent naturalizations are no longer possible. By forbidding any naturalizations within three months before a Federal election, it has put a stop to naturalizations for political purposes; by requiring reports of pending naturalizations and returns of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

naturalizations conferred to be made to a central bureau in Washington, it has introduced uniformity of practice among the many courts which were before administering the law in innumerably variant ways; it has rendered collusion between courts and naturalization lawyers impossible, by requiring that the Government at Washington shall be informed of every application for naturalization at least three months before the application is heard.

Along with the insistence upon reform in our naturalization laws has always gone an earnest request for a law to define American citizenship, to do away with the uncertainties and obscurities which have surrounded it and to declare how it may be lost. Both the naturalization law and the citizenship law resulted from a notable cooperation between the Executive and Congress; both pased Congress with hardly any debate in the House and none in the Senate, and both had little opposition in the Lower House and none in the Upper. Because of the lack of opposition they did not attract the attention which their importance deserved; and, as comparatively few people realized their full portent, such discontent as they have occasioned has come too late. That there is discontent goes without saying. So far as the naturalization law is concerned, the objections to it comes chiefly from petty courts throughout the country which are now not permitted to naturalize, and which formerly derived part of their prestige and their fees from naturalization business. Dissatisfaction with the new citizenship law flows from those people who have been living abroad in fancied security of their American citizenship, and who now find themselves obliged to take positive steps to preserve a status which they have heretofore supposed attached to them indefinitely, without the performance of any obligations on their part. Both of these laws originated in the House of Representatives, but each resulted from a report made by executive officers, and the Senate can claim little agency in them. The citizenship law was based upon a report made to Secretary Root by a board of officers of his Department, the members being James Brown Scott, the Solicitor for the Department of State, David Jayne Hill, our Minister at The Hague, and the writer of this article, with Samuel B. Crandall, Ph.D., of the Department as Secretary. The original desire of the Executive had been to have an examination into the question made by a larger body composed of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

jurists and publicists not in the public service, and Secretaries Hay and Root both asked Congress to create such a commission; but the House Committee on Foreign Affairs reported against the project, and suggested that the Secretary of State appoint a board of officers of his own Department to make the report. Secretary Root then named the board which met last summer and presented a report and recommendations which he forwarded to Congress with a strong endorsement. From this report sprang a bill, introduced in the House by the Hon. James Breck Perkins of New York, which became a law on March 2nd.

The law does not change or even modify the American doctrine of citizenship. That was already settled by the Constitution and the decisions of the Supreme Court. Anybody born in the United States, no matter what his race, unless he is an Indian living with a tribe, or however ineligible to our citizenship he may be for any other reason, is a citizen of the United States. His foreign mother may have been merely passing through the United States, and he may have been sent beyond our borders a moment after he was born; he may never have seen the United States except with a baby's eyes; all these things are of no consequence. Birth, mere birth, accidental or not, in the United States gives citizenship of the United States. It attaches to the child no matter what his parents may do, until he reaches manhood, when he may choose another nationality. Probably the world will never agree whether the doctrine of citizenship by birth or of citizenship by descent is the more reasonable. We inherited the former with the English common law, and this country and England are its two most important supporters.

Broadly speaking, an individual becomes a citizen of the United States by birth or naturalization, and these facts have been well settled; but how does he lose American citizenship? This was the question to which the citizenship board chiefly addressed itself, and which Congress settled a few months ago by declaring that an American shall be held to have expatriated himself when he becomes naturalized as a citizen of another country, or when he takes an oath of allegiance to another state, or when he lives permanently outside of the United States without intent to return; and, whereas our doctrine of citizenship comes from feudalism and the common law, our rule of expatriation comes from the Roman law and the *code Napoléon*. The rule is simple enough,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and no American has a right to complain if, by violating it, he finds he has by his own act lost his American nationality; nor will any complaint be heard from those who lose our citizenship as a consequence of deliberately acquiring another; but protests long and loud will surely come from those who find themselves cut off from the protection of this government because of their prolonged residence in foreign lands. The naturalization law had already endeavored to reach them. It was directed chiefly to the point of preventing frauds upon our citizenship in this country; but, while the bill was under discussion in the House, Mr. Crumpacker of Indiana carried an amendment which was designed to reach a class of fraudulent citizens who had thus far supposed themselves immune from punishment, and who enjoy the protection of the United States while they live permanently under some other government.

That the naturalization laws of the United States have always offered an easy avenue of approach to citizenship, and that the way was carelessly guarded, are facts which have been well known in other countries; and the consequence has been that many foreigners have come here with the express purpose of securing naturalization and going away immediately afterwards. We make few demands upon our citizens while they are at home and none when they are abroad, and we are zealous in protecting them from the demands of foreign governments. The inevitable consequence has been that we have had a constantly increasing number of so-called American citizens living abroad—men who have lived in the United States for only five years and in many cases have fraudulently secured naturalization papers after less than five years of residence; who never were really domiciled here; who never have performed any of the duties of American citizenship and who never intended to do so; who play no part in the development of the United States and are merely a burden to its government. They hold in their hands certificates which proclaim them to be American citizens; they are often loud in their assertions of loyalty to the United States; they claim rights, but perform no corresponding duties. In a notable report on naturalization, made to Congress in 1905 by Secretary Hay, he showed that sixteen per cent. of the naturalized citizens who applied to him for passports had been naturalized within six months of the date of their applications—had been naturalized,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in fact, after they had determined to go abroad and in order that they might go under American protection—and that passports were often applied for on the same day on which the naturalizations were secured. When it is remembered that many travellers go abroad without securing passports and depend upon their certificates of naturalization as sufficient proof of their citizenship, it becomes plain that the number of people who have lived in the United States as aliens and have gone abroad as citizens is considerable. Until the new naturalization law went into effect, it was not actually against the letter of the law for a man to commit this fraud; for, when he applied for citizenship, he was required merely to show that he had resided in the United States for five years, and no inquiry was made concerning his future intentions. The new naturalization law requires that he must not only be resident in the United States, but that he must entertain in good faith an intention of continuing to reside here, and that this fact shall appear on his naturalization certificate. Mr. Crumpacker's amendment logically pursued this requirement by providing that, if any one who was naturalized should go abroad and establish a permanent residence within five years after his naturalization he should be presumed, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, to have acquired his naturalization in bad faith, and by proper proceedings in court it should be set aside. The new citizenship law goes a step further by providing that any naturalized American citizen who goes abroad at any time to reside permanently shall be held to have expatriated himself, and that the permanence of the residence shall be presumed after he has resided for two years in the country of which he was previously a citizen, or for five years in some other foreign country; but the presumption may be overcome by proof that the residence is only temporary and that an intent to return exists. This part of the law only applies to naturalized citizens, and it is in fact the only place in the new law in which any discrimination is made between them and native citizens. The discrimination is only fair, however, for one who has already changed his nationality is more apt to change it again than one who has never changed it at all, and some action to protect us from imposition on the part of naturalized citizens who leave the United States had become necessary. One thing which has made it more necessary than it has ever

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been before is the great tide of emigration which is setting towards our shores. Thousands upon thousands of the aliens who are coming in will become naturalized as American citizens; some of them will go back when they have made a competency; others will go back because they have not made a competency; a turn from industrial prosperity to industrial depression in the country will cause many to take ship for home or for foreign lands where the chances of bread-winning may appear to be more favorable than they are here. An intolerable condition of affairs would eventually come about if these men should be free to claim American citizenship as long as they chose to do so, and the only way to avoid this is to require some affirmative action on their part as the price of their continuing to be considered Americans.

I have said that the expatriation law is the culmination of many years of effort to secure reform in our citizenship; but it is more than that. It has settled a question which vexed the minds of our statesmen from the time of the foundation of the republic, and, historically considered, it is a stone to mark the progress of liberal ideas. The Declaration of Independence enumerated among the grievances of the Colonies against George III that he had interfered with the naturalization of aliens, and before the Constitution was adopted all the States conferred naturalization. The Constitution provided, as a matter of course, for a Federal rule of naturalization, and the right to make Americans out of aliens was regarded as a cardinal principle of American policy. It was insisted, too, from the beginning of the Government that one thus received into our fold ceased to be an alien, and, except in the matter of the holding of a few offices, enjoyed the same rights as a native American, having by his naturalization experienced a new political birth. This was American law, but there was at the same time the heritage which had come to us of the English common law and its rule that a man who was once an Englishman could never by any means be anything else, and we tacitly accepted this doctrine also. The illogical position was thus presented of a country with liberal laws by which a foreigner could become its citizen, and no laws at all by which its citizen could become a foreigner. In the absence of statute, the courts naturally fell back on the common law, and generally ruled that there was no way by which an American could divest himself of his citizenship. The political

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

branch of the Government, less trammelled by precedent, declared that, if expatriation was a right of a foreigner, it was a right of an American; and while Secretaries of State were refusing to give a man protection while he was abroad, on the ground that he had expatriated himself, the courts were declaring that he was still an American so far as his rights at home were concerned.

This anomalous condition prevailed until certain events occurred which concentrated public attention upon it and forced it to an issue. Shortly after the Civil War, when the feeling of strong nationality was at its height, a number of Americans born in Ireland returning to that country were arrested charged with political offences, and at the same time there were a number of arrests in Germany of former Germans on the ground that they had not performed their military duty, and in both countries the validity of the naturalization of the arrested men was denied. As they had many friends in the United States, and as many thousands of our citizens were of Irish and German nativity, public opinion became aroused, one State legislature after another proclaimed the right of expatriation and petitions for action poured in upon Congress. It is a common statement that the law of 1868 was passed in fear of German and Irish voters in the United States, who were so numerous in the North and West that no man could long enjoy public life if they marked him for destruction; but this is a short-sighted view of a movement which was only accelerated by circumstances, being, in fact, the natural and inevitable result of the American policy of naturalization. If foreigners were to be admitted to every right of citizenship in the United States, then they ought to be recognized as American citizens in other countries, even in the country of their nativity. Naturalization was a barren privilege if it did not carry with it the right to this Government's protection everywhere in the world. The act of 1868 was introduced by the Committee of Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives through General N. P. Banks of Massachusetts, the chairman, with a notable report which was an able defence of the right of expatriation. The bill was debated extensively in both House and Senate by the leading statesmen of the day, and its principle was accepted by all. The debate turned almost entirely, however, upon the right of a foreigner to become a citizen of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the United States and to be recognized as such by foreign governments, and an effort made to introduce a concomitant measure declaring how an American might accomplish expatriation failed to arouse interest, because no actual cases demanded attention. The consequence was that the bill as passed entirely ignored this side of the question. It proclaimed expatriation to be an inherent right of all men, that any opinion of a judicial or executive officer of the United States to the contrary was opposed to American policy, that any claim of a foreign government to the allegiance of one of its former citizens who had become naturalized as an American citizen was without justification, and that naturalized citizens who went abroad were entitled to the same protection of persons and property from this Government as native citizens; but it went no further. Nevertheless, this law has always been construed as meaning that an American has the right of expatriation as well as a foreigner, and the conflict of opinion on the subject was put to sleep; but it left the question of what should be held to constitute expatriation where it was before. Our population consists of citizens, naturalized or native, and foreigners, and a man of foreign birth is a foreigner until he is naturalized. Was it not, therefore, logical to say that an American could not become a foreigner until he should obtain foreign naturalization? If mere domicile in the United States did not confer American citizenship, should mere domicile in a foreign country take it away? This was the great question which the legislation of 1868 left no nearer settlement than it had been in 1795, when the Supreme Court said, through Judge Paterson: "A statute of the United States relative to expatriation is much wanted. . . . Besides, ascertaining by positive law the manner in which expatriation may be effected would obviate doubts, render the subject notorious and easy of apprehension, and furnish the rule of civil conduct on a very interesting point." The question was finally settled by the new citizenship law after one hundred and nineteen years of waiting.

As I have said, our doctrine of citizenship is that a man belongs to the soil on which he is born; but, early in our history as a nation, we adopted a law contradictory to this and declared that a child born of American parents temporarily abroad was an American citizen. No explanation of the contradiction need be attempted and none can be successfully made; for, if the doc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trine is completely right, the law is wrong. The law was, at first, applicable only to those already born abroad, and for some years the status of foreign-born American children was uncertain, until Horace Binney took up their cause, and with the aid of Daniel Webster in the Senate secured the legislation which now stands. Just in principle as this law is, it has given opportunity for a number of cases of flagrant imposition upon this Government and foreign governments. Children born abroad of American parents grow up in foreign lands, do not even learn our language, and are educated with a view to their remaining abroad all their lives; but they assert American nationality as soon as they reach the age when they become liable to perform military service to the government under which they are living. Their citizenship is of no benefit to us, but of great profit to them; and their claim to our protection often causes friction between this Government and that of the country in which they were born. The new citizenship law requires them, as the price of their protection as American citizens, to report to an American consul upon reaching the age of eighteen years and declare their intention of remaining American citizens and of residing in the United States, and upon reaching the age of twenty-one to take the oath of allegiance. One who wilfully neglects these requirements, or having fulfilled them nevertheless makes his permanent residence in foreign lands, forfeits the right to American protection.

Before closing this paper, it is proper to glance at the question of the status of married women under the new law. The position of spinsters need not concern us, for their citizenship is subject to the same rules as apply to men. They may be naturalized or they may expatriate themselves as men do; but, as soon as one of them marries, she becomes subject to special provisions of law. Our first naturalization laws said nothing about married women, and the courts generally held that, as naturalization was a personal privilege, a foreign woman did not acquire American citizenship by marrying an American, nor an American woman lose it by marrying a foreigner. The woman's position was thus more independent in the early days of the Republic than it became later, for in 1855 a law was passed which required that a foreign woman who married an American should be considered an American. The act was, however, silent on the subject of the status of an American woman who married a foreigner.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some State laws declared she did not lose her American citizenship, court decisions were contradictory, and the Executive, following the rule that the husband and wife are one, the husband being that one, declined to claim her as an American in international intercourse. If her status was uncertain while she was married, it became even more so when she became a widow or secured a divorce. How was she to regain her citizenship which she had lost by her marriage? Although American-born, must she sue for naturalization like a foreign-born alien? Without any law to justify it, she was generally considered as regaining her American nationality by simply residing in the United States, but when she went abroad, and especially when she went to the country of which her husband had been a citizen, it was hard to say what she was or to make any certain claim to her allegiance. It is true that the determination of a woman's citizenship is not ordinarily as important a matter as it is in the case of a man; but when it is remembered that aliens are not permitted in many foreign countries and in several of the States of the Union to inherit or acquire real estate, it becomes apparent that the question of a woman's nationality is often of vital importance to her. The citizenship law has removed the citizenship of women from the realms of doubt by ordering that an American woman marrying a foreigner shall lose her American nationality as long as the marital relation lasts. When it terminates by the death of her husband or by their absolute divorce, she may revert to her American citizenship by residing in the United States, or, if she is abroad, by declaring her intention to reside in the United States before an American consul; but she may retain the nationality of her husband by making formal election of her desire to do so. On the other hand, a foreign woman who becomes an American citizen through her marriage shall, upon the termination of the marital relation, be presumed to have retained her husband's citizenship if she continues to reside in the United States, unless she formally declares her intention to return to the foreign allegiance which she had before her marriage.

Such, briefly put down, are the provisions of this notable law designed to carry out to the full the enlightened American doctrine of expatriation, and to elevate our citizenship by expelling from it those who obtained it for fraudulent reasons and who seek to put it to base purposes. GAILLARD HUNT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MARK TWAIN.

BY WILLIAM LYON PHELPS, LAMPSON PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH LITERATURE AT YALE UNIVERSITY.

DURING the last twenty years, a profound change has taken place in the attitude of the reading public toward Mark Twain. I can remember very well when he was regarded merely as a humorist, and one opened his books with an anticipatory grin. Very few supposed that he belonged to literature; and a complete, uniform edition of his "Works" would perhaps have been received with something of the mockery that greeted Ben Jonson's folio in 1616. Professor Richardson's "American Literature," which is still a standard work, appeared originally in 1886. My copy, which bears the date 1892, contains only two references in the index to Mark Twain, while Mr. Cable, for example, receives ten; and the whole volume fills exactly 990 pages. Looking up one of the two references, we find the following opinion:

"But there is a class of writers, authors ranking below Irving or Lowell, and lacking the higher artistic or moral purpose of the greater humorists, who amuse a generation and then pass from sight. Every period demands a new manner of jest, after the current fashion. . . . The reigning favorites of the day are Frank R. Stockton, Joel Chandler Harris, the various newspaper jokers, and 'Mark Twain.' But the creators of 'Pomona' and 'Rudder Grange,' of 'Uncle Remus and his Folk-lore Stories,' and 'Innocents Abroad,' clever as they are, must make hay while the sun shines. Twenty years hence, unless they chance to enshrine their wit in some higher literary achievement, their unknown successors will be the privileged comedians of the republic. Humor alone never gives its masters a place in literature; it must co-exist with literary qualities, and must usually be joined with such pathos as one finds in Lamb, Hood, Irving or Holmes."

It is interesting to remember that before this pronouncement

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was published, "Tom Sawyer" and "Huckleberry Finn" had been read by thousands. Professor Richardson continued: "Two or three divisions of American humor deserve somewhat more respectful treatment," and he proceeds to give a full page to Petroleum V. Nasby, another page to Artemus Ward and two and one-half pages to Josh Billings, while Mark Twain had received less than four lines. After stating that, in the case of authors like Mark Twain, "temporary amusement, not literary product, is the thing sought and given," Professor Richardson announces that the department of fiction will be considered later. In this "department," Mark Twain is not mentioned at all, although Julian Hawthorne receives over three pages!

I have quoted Professor Richardson at length, because he represents an attitude toward Mark Twain that was common all during the eighties. Another college professor, who is to-day one of the best living American critics, says, in his "Initial Studies in American Letters" (1895), "Though it would be ridiculous to maintain that either of these writers [Artemus Ward and Mark Twain] takes rank with Lowell and Holmes, . . . still it will not do to ignore them as mere buffoons, or even to predict that their humors will soon be forgotten." There is no allusion in his book to "Tom Sawyer" or "Huckleberry Finn," nor does the critic seem to regard their creator as in any sense a novelist. Still another writer, in a passing allusion to Mark Twain, says, "Only a very small portion of his writing has any place as literature."

Literary opinions change as time progresses; and no one could have observed the remarkable demonstration at the seventieth birthday of our great national humorist without feeling that most of his contemporaries regarded him, not as their peer, but as their Chief. Without wishing to make any invidious comparisons, I cannot refrain from commenting on the statement that it would be "ridiculous" to maintain that Mark Twain takes rank with Oliver Wendell Holmes. It is, of course, absolutely impossible to predict the future; the only real test of the value of a book is Time. Who now reads Cowley? Time has laughed at so many contemporary judgments that it would be foolhardy to make positive assertions about literary stock quotations one hundred years from now. Still, guesses are not prohibited; and I think it not unlikely that the name of Mark Twain will out-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

last the name of Holmes. American Literature would surely be the poorer if the great Boston Brahmin had not enlivened it with his rich humor, his lambent wit and his sincere pathos; but the whole content of his work seems slighter than the big American prose epics of the man of our day.

Indeed, it seems to me that Mark Twain is our foremost living American writer. He has not the subtlety of Henry James or the wonderful charm of Mr. Howells; he could not have written "Daisy Miller," or "A Modern Instance," or "Indian Summer," or "The Kentons"—books of which every American should be proud, for they exhibit literary quality of an exceedingly high order. I have read these books over and over again, with constantly increasing profit and delight. I wish that Mr. Howells might live forever, and give to every generation the pure intellectual joy that he has given to ours. But the natural endowment of Mark Twain is still greater. Mr. Howells has made the most of himself; God has done it all for Mark Twain. If there be a living American writer touched with true genius, whose books glow with the divine fire, it is he. He has always been a conscientious artist; but no amount of industry could ever have produced a "Huckleberry Finn."

When I was a child at the West Middle Grammar School of Hartford, on one memorable April day, Mark Twain addressed the graduating-class. I was thirteen years old, but I have found it impossible to forget what he said. The subject of his "remarks" was Methuselah. He informed us that Methuselah lived to the ripe old age of nine hundred and sixty-nine. But he might as well have lived to be several thousand—nothing happened. The speaker told us that we should all live longer than Methuselah. Fifty years of Europe are better than a cycle of Cathay, and twenty years of modern American life are longer and richer in content than the old patriarch's thousand. Ours will be the true age in which to live, when more will happen in a day than in a year of the flat existence of our ancestors. I cannot remember his words; but what a fine thing it is to hear a speech, and carry away an idea!

I have since observed that this idea runs through much of his literary work. His philosophy of life underlies his broadest burlesque—for "A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court" is simply an exposure of the "good old times." Mark Twain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

believes in the Present, in human progress. Too often do we apprehend the Middle Ages through the glowing pages of Spenser and Walter Scott; we see only glittering processions of "ladies dead and lovely knights." Mark Twain shows us the wretched condition of the common people, their utter ignorance and degradation, the coarseness and immorality of technical chivalry, the cruel and unscrupulous ecclesiastical tyranny and the capricious insolence of the barons. One may regret that he has reversed the dynamics in so glorious a book as Malory's "Morte d'Arthur," but, through all the buffoonery and roaring mirth with which the knights in armor are buried, the artistic and moral purpose of the satirist is clear. If I understand him rightly, he would have us believe that *our* age, not theirs, is the "good time"; nay, ours is the age of magic and wonder. We need not regret in melancholy sentimentality and picturesqueness of bygone days, for we ourselves live, not in a material and commonplace generation, but in the very midst of miracles and romance. Merlin and the Fay Morgana would have given all their petty skill to have been able to use a telephone or a phonograph, or to see a moving picture. The sleeping princess and her castle were awakened by a kiss; but in the twentieth century a man in Washington touches a button, and hundreds of miles away tons of machinery begin to move, fountains begin to play and the air resounds with the whir of wheels. In comparison with to-day, the age of chivalry seems dull and poor. Even in chivalry itself our author is more knightly than Lancelot; for was there ever a more truly chivalrous performance than Mark Twain's essay on Harriet Shelley, or his literary monument to Joan of Arc? In these earnest pages, our national humorist appears as the true knight.

Mark Twain's humor is purely American. It is not the humor of Washington Irving, which resembles that of Addison and Thackeray; it is not delicate and indirect. It is genial, sometimes outrageous, mirth—laughter holding both his sides. I have found it difficult to read him in a library or on a street-car, for explosions of pent-up mirth or a distorted face are apt to attract unpleasant attention in such public places. Mark Twain's humor is boisterous, uproarious, colossal, overwhelming. As has often been remarked, the Americans are not naturally a gay people, like the French; nor are we light-hearted and careless, like the Irish and the Negro. At heart, we are intensely serious,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nervous, melancholy. For humor, therefore, we naturally turn to buffoonery and burlesque, as a reaction against the strain and tension of life. Our attitude is something like that of the lonely author of the "Anatomy of Melancholy," who used to lean over the parapet of Magdalen Bridge, and shake with mirth at the horrible jokes of the bargemen. We like Mark Twain's humor, not because we are frivolous, but because we are just the reverse. I have never known a frivolous person who really enjoyed or appreciated Mark Twain.

The essence of Mark Twain's humor is Incongruity. The jumping frog is named Daniel Webster; and, indeed, the intense gravity of a frog's face, with the droop at the corners of the mouth, might well be envied by many an American Senator. When the shotted frog vainly attempted to leave the earth, he shrugged his shoulders "like a Frenchman." Bilgewater and the Dolphin on the raft are grotesquely incongruous figures. The rescuing of Jim from his prison cell is full of the most incongruous ideas, his common-sense attitude toward the whole transaction contrasting strangely with that of the romantic Tom. Along with the constant incongruity goes the element of surprise —which Professor Beers has well pointed out. When one begins a sentence, in an apparently serious discussion, one never knows how it will end. In discussing the peace that accompanies religious faith, Mark Twain says that he has often been impressed with the calm confidence of a Christian with four aces. Exaggeration — deliberate, enormous hyperbole — is another feature. Rudyard Kipling, who has been profoundly influenced by Mark Twain, and has learned much from him, often employs the same device, as in "Brugglesmith." Irreverence is also a noteworthy quality. In his travel-books, we are given the attitude of the typical American Philistine toward the wonders and sacred relics of the Old World, the whole thing being a gigantic burlesque on the sentimental guide-books which were so much in vogue before the era of Baedeker. With so much continuous fun and mirth, satire and burlesque, it is no wonder that Mark Twain should not always be at his best. He is doubtless sometimes flat, sometimes coarse, as all humorists since Rabelais have been. The wonder is that his level has been so high. I remember, just before the appearance of "Following the Equator," I had been told that Mark Twain's inspiration was finally gone, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that he could not be funny if he tried. To test this, I opened the new book, and this is what I found on the first page:

"We sailed for America, and there made certain preparations. This took but little time. Two members of my family elected to go with me. Also a carbuncle. The dictionary says a carbuncle is a kind of jewel. Humor is out of place in a dictionary."

Although Mark Twain has the great qualities of the true humorist—common sense, human sympathy and an accurate eye for proportion—he is much more than a humorist. His work shows very high literary quality, the quality that appears in first-rate novels. He has shown himself to be a genuine artist. He has done something which many popular novelists have signally failed to accomplish—he has created real characters. His two wonderful boys, Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn, are wonderful in quite different ways. The creator of Tom exhibited remarkable observation; the creator of Huck showed the divine touch of imagination. Tom is the American boy—he is "smart." In having his fence whitewashed, in controlling a pool of Sabbath-school tickets at the precise psychological moment, he displays abundant promise of future success in business. Huck, on the other hand, is the child of nature, harmless, sincere and crudely imaginative. His reasonings with Jim about nature and God belong to the same department of natural theology as that illustrated in Browning's "Caliban." The night on the raft with Jim, when these two creatures look aloft at the stars, and Jim reckons the moon laid them, is a case in point.

"We had the sky up there, all speckled with stars, and we used to lay on our backs and look up at them, and discuss about whether they was made or just happened. Jim he allowed they was made, but I allowed they happened; I judged it would have took too long to *make* so many. Jim said the moon could a *laid* them; well, that looked kind of reasonable, so I didn't say nothing against it, because I've seen a frog lay most as many, so of course it could be done. We used to watch the stars that fell, too, and see them streak down. Jim allowed they'd got spoiled and was hove out of the nest."

Again, Mark Twain has so much dramatic power that, were his literary career beginning instead of closing, he might write for us the great American play that we are still awaiting. The story of the feud between the Grangerfords and the Shepherdsons is thrillingly dramatic, and the tragic climax grips one by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heart. The shooting of the drunken Boggs, the gathering of the mob and its control by one masterful personality, belong essentially to true drama, and are written with power and insight. The pathos of these scenes is never false, never mawkish or overdone; it is the pathos of life itself. Mark Twain's extraordinary skill in descriptive passages shows, not merely keen observation, but the instinct for the specific word—the one word that is always better than any of its synonyms, for it makes the picture real—it creates the illusion, which is the essence of all literary art. The storm, for example:

"It was my watch below till twelve, but I wouldn't a turned in anyway if I'd had a bed, because a body don't see such a storm as that every day in the week, not by a long sight. My souls, how the wind did scream along! And every second or two there'd come a glare that lit up the white-caps for a half a mile around, and you'd see the islands looking dusty through the rain, and the trees thrashing around in the wind; then comes a *h-wach!*—bum! bum! bumble-umble-um-bum-bum-bum-bum—and the thunder would go rumbling and grumbling away, and quit—and then *rip* comes another flash and another sockdolager. The waves 'most washed me off the raft sometimes, but I hadn't any clothes on, and didn't mind. We didn't have no trouble about snags; the lightning was glaring and flittering around so constant that we could see them plenty soon enough to throw her head this way or that and miss them."

"Tom Sawyer" and "Huckleberry Finn" are prose epics of American life. The former is one of those books—of which "The Pilgrim's Progress," "Gulliver's Travels" and "Robinson Crusoe" are supreme examples—that are read at different periods of one's life from very different points of view; so that it is not easy to say when one enjoys them the most—before one understands their real significance or after. Nearly all healthy boys enjoy reading "Tom Sawyer," because the intrinsic interest of the story is so great, and the various adventures of the hero are portrayed with such gusto. Yet it is impossible to outgrow the book. The eternal Boy is there, and one cannot appreciate the nature of boyhood properly until one has ceased to be a boy. The other masterpiece, "Huckleberry Finn," is really not a child's book at all. Children devour it, but they do not digest it. It is a permanent picture of a certain period of American history, and this picture is made complete, not so much by the striking portraits of individuals placed on the huge canvas, as by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vital unity of the whole composition. If one wishes to know what life on the Mississippi really was, to know and understand the peculiar social conditions of that highly exciting time, one has merely to read through this powerful narrative, and a definite, coherent, vivid impression remains.

By those who have lived there, and whose minds are comparatively free from prejudice, Mark Twain's pictures of life in the South before the war are regarded as, on the whole, nearer the truth than those supplied by any other artist. One reason for this is the aim of the author; he was not trying to support or to defend any particular theory—no, his aim was purely and wholly artistic. In "Uncle Tom's Cabin," a book by no means devoid of literary art, the red-hot indignation of the author largely nullified her evident desire to tell the truth. If one succeeds in telling the truth about anything whatever, one must have something more than the *desire* to tell the truth; one must know how to do it. False impressions do not always, probably do not commonly, come from deliberate liars. Mrs. Stowe's astonishing work is not really the history of slavery; it is the history of abolition sentiment. On the other hand, writers so graceful, talented and clever as Mr. Page and Mr. Hopkinson Smith do not always give us pictures that correctly represent, except locally, the actual situation before the war; for these gentlemen seem to have "Uncle Tom's Cabin" in mind. Mark Twain gives us both points of view; he shows us the beautiful side of slavery—for it had a wonderfully beautiful, patriarchal side—and he also shows us the horror of it. The living dread of the negro that he would be sold down the river, has never been more vividly represented than when the poor woman in "Pudd'nhead Wilson" sees the water swirling against the snag, and realizes that she is bound the wrong way. That one scene makes an indelible impression on the reader's mind, and counteracts tons of polemics. The peculiar harmlessness of Jim is beautiful to contemplate. Although he and Huck really own the raft, and have taken all the risk, they obey implicitly the orders of the two tramps who call themselves Duke and King. Had that been a raft on the Connecticut River, and had Huck and Jim been Yankees, they would have said to the intruders, "Whose raft is this, anyway?"

Mark Twain may be trusted to tell the truth; for the eye of the born caricature artist always sees the salient point. Caricatures

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

often give us a better idea of their object than a photograph; for the things that are exaggerated, be it a large nose, or a long neck, are, after all, the things that differentiate this particular individual from the mass. Everybody remembers how Tweed was caught by one of Nast's cartoons.

Mark Twain is through and through American. If foreigners really wish to know the American spirit, let them read Mark Twain. He is far more American than their favorite specimen, Walt Whitman. The essentially American qualities of common sense, energy, enterprise, good humor and Philistinism fairly shriek from his pages. He reveals us in our limitations, in our lack of appreciation of certain beautiful things, fully as well as he pictures us in coarser but more triumphant aspects. It is, of course, preposterous to say that Americans are totally different from other humans; we have no monopoly of common sense and good humor, nor are we all hide-bound Philistines. But there is something pronounced in the American character, and the books of Mark Twain reveal it. He has also more than once been a valuable and efficient champion. Without being an offensive and blatant Jingo, I think he is well satisfied to be an American.

Mark Twain is our great Democrat. Democracy is his political, social and moral creed. His hatred of snobbery, affectation and assumed superiority is total. His democracy has no limits; it is bottomless and far-reaching. Nothing seems really sacred to him except the sacred right of every individual to do exactly as he pleases; which means, of course, that no one can interfere with another's right, for then democracy would be the privilege of a few, and would stultify itself. Not only does the spirit of democracy breathe out from all his greater books, but it is shown in specific instances, such as "Travelling with a Reformer"; and Mark Twain has more than once given testimony for his creed, without recourse to the pen.

At the head of all American novelists, living and dead, stands Nathaniel Hawthorne, unapproached, possibly unapproachable. His fine and subtle art is an altogether different thing from the art of our mighty, democratic, national humorist. But Literature is wonderfully diverse in its content; and the historian of American Letters, in the far future, will probably find it impossible to omit the name of Mark Twain, whose books have warmed human hearts all over the world.

WILLIAM LYON PHELPS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

BY FREDERIC TABER COOPER, THOMAS WALSH AND CLAYTON HAMILTON.

"THE PRINCESS."*

MARGARET POTTER is one of those authors whom it seems worth while to discuss seriously, not so much on account of their achievement, as because of the potential force they have revealed that promises still greater things in the near future. The value of her productions up to the present day, inclusive of her latest volume, "The Princess," is to be determined only by boldly striking a balance between their many obvious merits and equally obvious faults. There is a spectacular quality about her style, an Oriental vividness of verbal coloring that draws attention like the flamboyant contrasts of an artistic poster. And when the reader's attention is once drawn and held, he finds that underneath the surface glow and glitter there is a drama in the course of enactment that is throbbing painfully with tense human passions,—a drama not merely original, but of purposed audacity. These, then, are Mrs. Potter's chief assets: a fertile invention and fearless handling of unique situations; a rush and sweep of word and phrase which seem often to symbolize the pent-up flood of emotions it interprets; and most important of all, because herein lies the chief hope for her future work, a very real and frank recognition of the basic, primordial human passions and weaknesses, an ability to make us conscious of the warring elements of flesh and spirit in every man and woman.

Having conceded these gifts, one must add the qualifying comment that Margaret Potter does not always make the best use of

* "The Princess." By Margaret Potter. New York: Harper & Brothers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them. Instead of controlling her very uncommon power and fertility of language, she often gives it too free a rein. She has not yet learned the forcefulness of restraint and simplicity. Her flow of words seems always under a certain hydraulic pressure. In picturing life, she deliberately chooses exceptional types, those who live upon the heights, who occupy the seats of the mighty. She holds a mirror up to nature, but it often suits her purpose to select a mirror with a curved surface, which curiously magnifies and exalts certain characters, and changes the perspective and the focal point. She needs the accessories of royal robes, the pomp and splendor of the throne-room, the prerogatives of despotic power, to gain her best effects. She prefers to hold our interest by the force of contrast, rather than to make her appeal to the ultimate kinship of human hearts.

"The Princess," which furnishes the excuse and the justification of the present analysis, represents the highest achievement of its author yet given to the public. Announced as the second volume of a trilogy of Russian life, which began with "The Genius," it is easily a long step in advance of the earlier volume. The background of the story, not merely the nomenclature of streets and buildings, but the pervading sense of a social system and an ethical code differing essentially from our own, is drawn in with a sureness of touch that reveals not merely the patient hours of faithful study and careful documentation, but also that inborn gift of reconstruction, that instinct for visualizing distant lands or vanished epochs. And to understand how helpless mere knowledge may be, without that further gift, one need only recall those soulless productions of erudition, Becker's "Charicles" and "Gallus."

Of the plot of "The Princess," it does not seem necessary to speak here in detail. It is too big, too complex, too panoramic, to lend itself readily to a brief retelling. The action passes within the imperial circles of modern Russia; much of it, indeed, within the threshold of the imperial palace. The various members of the reigning house pass in and out of the story, each of them sketched in with bold confidence, and each impressing you, as you read, that they are real people, with real emotions and not at all the conventional lay figures of the usual historical novel. The central theme of "The Princess," as the foreword explicitly states, is the Loneliness of the Great, the price that royalty has to pay, in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

standing aloof from the multitude and solving the riddle of creation alone and unaided. And the specific case which Margaret Potter has selected to illustrate her theme is the life of a certain Russian princess, who having, through long years of wedded misery, borne proudly and silently the degradation of a husband's cruelty and neglect and open infidelity, must begin over again the same silent struggle in the case of her son, whom she cannot with all her love keep from the vileness of the life his father led before him, nor from the wretchedness of a loveless marriage like her own. The book has in it a certain strain of mysticism, a strange visitation from time to time of a dead and gone musician, whom her readers will recall as having played the leading rôle in "The Genius." This reincarnate spirit, who comes again and again to the Princess in her hours of bitterest need, to warn her how she may avoid the doom hanging over those dear to her, may be taken seriously, or as a mere figment of her brain. But in either case, what the author wishes to drive home is the fact that, for those who endure the Loneliness of the Great, it is impossible, even though a warning may come to them from the dead, to break away from the trammels of custom, to be untrue to the prescribed code of their order.

There is one other thought which it seems worth while to express in connection with "The Princess," and that is in regard to what is conventionally regarded as a proper or improper subject for current fiction. As already intimated, the book handles with the greatest frankness the phases of life which are an inevitable consequence of the profligacy of the mighty. And there is no very good reason why it should not, so long as it treats life honestly and fearlessly. And yet, such are the conventions that regulate the propriety of the novels we read, that if Margaret Potter had chosen to lay her scene in New York and attribute to American men and women one tithe of the frailties that she assigns to titled Russians, the book would have called forth a vigorous protest. And this is a pity, because it simply compels a novelist like Mrs. Potter, who has something definite to say about the basic facts of life, to leave her own country and wander far afield for her stage-settings, which must always have in them something of the artificial, the exaggerated, the spectacular. Nevertheless, Margaret Potter is one of the younger novelists to-day who display a healthy and vigorous talent, and one who is eminently worth watching.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

She seems just now to be at the parting of the ways. She belongs to the school of romantic fiction, and at present stands somewhere, let us say, between the talent of a George Sand and the sensationalism of a Ouida. The next year or two ought to show definitely in which of the directions she will ultimately turn her path.

FREDERIC TABER COOPER.

WRIGHT'S "LIFE OF WALTER PATER."*

THERE can be no gainsaying Walter Pater's preeminent interest to the student of literature, and so far as his personal history bears upon the processes of his thought and expression, investigations such as those pursued by Mr. Thomas Wright in his recent "Life of Walter Pater" have a distinct value. Nevertheless there is much that seems unnecessary and diffuse in these volumes: the biographer places too great a reliance upon the cumulative effect of unimportant conversations and recollections, and his anxiety to see Pater through the eyes of certain of his early friends promotes a sense of uneasiness in the reader lest there should be another side to many of these stories.

Mr. Wright purports to show us the real Pater—an unprepossessing boy whose retired disposition could be partly accounted for by his descent from a long line of Roman Catholics of Dutch origin who lived secluded from their neighbors in Buckinghamshire. He grew up amid a refined parsimony which showed itself in his later character in an abiding respect for the advantages of birth and prosperity. From the beginning we find him "playing at priest": a visionary boy full of the "lust of the eye" for all things beautiful, an exceeding horror of suffering, and an affection for cats.

At the King's School, Canterbury, he shows himself to be "essentially a monk—sometimes an ascetic and painfully devout monk, sometimes a mocking, sceptical monk." Mr. Benson has declared that Pater was popular among his schoolmates: his new biographer finds that they considered him a hopeless milksop, while he regarded them as barbarians. Snowballing, it seems, filled him with terror: he did not care for blackened eyes, nor for the pet snakes of his associates.

At Oxford, where he had won an exhibition, a marked revulsion

* "The Life of Walter Pater," by Thomas Wright. Two volumes. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of his religious feeling seems to have set in. He is no longer "the saintly boy" of Canterbury: Heraclitus, Pythagoras, Plato, Schelling and Hegel take the place of Stanley, Kingsley and Maurice. He spends vacations at Heidelberg: takes tea and is "tead with" assiduously: indulges in "Mephistophelian sneers" at trammelling creeds, quotes Voltaire and only relinquishes his intention of taking Anglican Orders when rebuffed by the Bishop of London at the instance of some of his own friends.

A classical fellowship at Brasenose College, Oxford, allowed him for the first time in his life to feel some security as to his finances; and at the thwarting of his purpose of taking orders, he turned with ardor to the philosophic and literary studies of the Renaissance. It was his period of emancipation: "Laughter gave him a saturnine, Mephistophelian look. Report said that he had sat to Solomon the painter for the portrait of Judas Iscariot."

In spite of his weakness in Greek and Latin, a weakness that could not be hidden even from his own pupils, Pater might entertain some expectations of advancement in the University. His relations with the students seem to have been amicable enough, for while he took little part in social affairs, he could look kindly on the undergraduates' horse-play. "They are like playful young tigers that have been fed," was one of his remembered phrases. On another occasion the recommendation of some reforms drew from him the protest: "I do not know what your object is. At present the undergraduate is a child of nature; he grows up like a wild rose in a country lane: you want to turn him into a turnip, rob him of all grace and plant him out in rows."

A second hitch in the programme of Pater's life was his difficulty with Jowett, the regius professor of Greek. It was a turning-point in his career. Up to this time Pater's teaching by word of mouth and pen could be summed up in the words, "Imitate the men of the Renaissance and enjoy yourself"—a doctrine which, added to his personal attitude and the extravagances of some of his so-called disciples, roused the opposition of Jowett to Pater's efforts to obtain the Proctorship, with its three hundred pounds a year. Mr. Benson has given a version of this affair to which Mr. Wright takes decided exception. He denies that Jowett had "wrongly identified Pater with the advanced æsthetic school and credited him with the views expressed by Mr. Rose, a character in Mr. Mallock's satiric

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

study of the day, "The New Republic." Mr. Wright contends that the trouble with Jowett occurred in 1874, before the æsthetic movement took shape at Oxford: while "The New Republic" did not appear until 1877.

For whatever cause, the loss of the Proctorship marked the advent of a new thought in Pater's writings,—the old Spartan and monastic doctrine of self-restraint and discipline, "the charm of *ascesis,* of the austere and serious girding of the loins in youth,"—the philosophy of his "Marius the Epicurean," of "Plato and Platonism," and "The Marbles of Ægina." Not that any outward change came over Pater's personal habits; indeed, many of these chapters on discipline were prepared "by a man in fairly good health who mortified himself by lying in bed half the day—who indeed actually wrote some of them between the sheets at near upon noon."

Mr. Wright furthermore has been greatly exercised at Mr. Benson's rather curious omission of any reference to St. Austin's Priory in Walworth, where a very ornate ritual was observed by a brotherhood in which Mr. Richard C. Jackson, an intimate associate of Pater's, figured for a while as the Rev. Brother a'Becket. That this gentleman was the original upon whom Pater based the character of his Marius, Mr. Wright seems amply to establish; indeed, Mr. Jackson's omnipresence in this new biography becomes almost a nuisance, although a recent communication to "The Academy," in which he exclaims against Mr. Wright's irreverent handling of Pater,—particularly the reference to him as "a vicarage Verlaine,"—would imply that he must not be held sponsor for all that these volumes convey.

In a biography so extensive as that of Mr. Wright's, the almost total absence of details of Pater's home life leaves a sense of incompleteness. Here, as is also the case in Mr. Benson's work, there is no *Pater-familias.* Much matter, however, relating to his friends and colleagues, gives this recent *Life* considerable charm and value. The fair sex, indeed, will find little attention devoted to it; in fact, one of the rare instances in which the ladies figure on the scene is that in the anecdote of Pater at a large reception in a Ladies' College at Oxford. The head of the house, seeing him approach, dropped her glove purposely. Instead of gallantly picking it up, he walked on and trod on it.

"Didn't you see how I rewarded the action?" he whispered to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an astonished friend. "If I had not remembered how, in spite of the honors heaped upon him by Queen Elizabeth, Sir Walter Raleigh was in the end led out to execution, perhaps I, too, might have made a fool of myself. Believe me, my dear sir, it was an insinuation of the devil that caused this woman to drop her glove."

Dr. F. W. Bussell, in summing up Pater's literary career, speaks of his life as "the gradual consecration of an exquisite sense of beauty to the highest ends: an almost literally exact advance through the stages of admiration in the Symposium, till at last he reached the sure haven, the one source of all that is fair and good." In the light of these words and of much that Mr. Wright has revealed to us, "Marius the Epicurean" assumes more and more the sense of a personal revelation of its author: into the figure of a friend, or more likely a composite of his friends, he has read the experiences of his own soul,—a soul "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought." "Marius" becomes, as it were, the Parsifal of æstheticism, and beneath its outward calm and precision goes on that eternal drama of "the soul at war with sense," which has been the foundation of all the supreme things of literature and art.

It was, therefore, with a certain fitness that Pater should devote his last days to the study of Pascal—that Calvinist of Rome—whose inner life presents so many correspondences with his own. Not only in the philosophy of the French thinker, but also in his very methods of expression, he found himself strangely mirrored at the last. In such a passage, for instance, as that from the essay "*Sur l'Eloquence et la Style*" lies all the philosophy of Pater's style: "The very same sense is materially affected by the words that convey it. The sense receives its dignity from the words rather than imparts it to them." It is indeed the key to the excellence and the defects of Pater's works. "If I live long enough," he once remarked to Mr. Edmund Gosse, "I shall learn quite to like writing." For the dictionary in bed was at once his rack and his pillow, and a word that pleased him must sooner or later have a place found for it in his writings. "Lose the whole world, but find the *mot propre*," he had learnt from Flaubert, whose style is considered the immediate model of his own. It is generally overlooked, however, that Flaubert was no stylist in the sense in which the French recognize it in a Renan or a Loti. There was something Teutonic in his cast of mind which we feel equally in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the work of Pater. As yet, unfortunately, we possess no proper estimate of the relationship and debt of the English pre-Raphaelite and æsthetic movement to the German Romanticists of the "blue flower."

It is in the word rather than in the phrase that we must continue to look for Pater's greatness as an artist. He himself early realized that his sense of rhythm was defective, for Mr. Wright conclusively shows that notwithstanding Mr. Benson's statement to the contrary, he endeavored to write verse, but without success. Therefore, it is to the eye rather than the ear that he makes his appeal; his is the art of the mosaicist who picks out his rich materials bit by bit and lights up or shadows them into precision, nuance or suggestion like some master workman in a shadowy apse of Monreale or Venice. It is a self-conscious kind of expression which Mr. Wright compares to that of the fashionable Claytons who used to preach in lavender kid gloves. Yet Pater smashed no domestic crockery merely to make a noise in the world; but built up slowly and surely a structure of beauty in its ultimate and purest conception. If his writings never brought him more than three hundred pounds a year, he might remember Renan's remark that "nothing is less important than prosperity," and if in glancing back over his half-lonely, half-misinterpreted life we find that it teaches a moral as well as an artistic lesson, we reach a conclusion in which there is no doubt that he, the English great master of "Art for Art's Sake" would himself rejoice.

THOMAS WALSH.

"NINEVEH, AND OTHER POEMS."*

A NEW poet is an event; and the mere promise of an accomplished and important poet is a matter of unusual moment. In "Nineveh, and Other Poems," Mr. George Sylvester Viereck has shown himself a poet, and has given promise of importance and accomplishment to come. His present volume exhibits a natural aptitude for emotional expression. He speaks in spontaneous and eloquent verse, melodious with memories of the recurrent haunting harmonies of Poe, the sea-surge of Mr. Swinburne and the plangent tenderness of Oscar Wilde, and ringing also with a

* "Nineveh, and Other Poems." By George Sylvester Viereck. New York: Moffat, Yard & Company. 1907.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

certain hammer-blow of passion which is entirely his own. He speaks with authority of the half-sensuous and half-religious hysteria of adolescence. He knows the awe of ancientness, the reverence of mystery, the sanctity of beauty. He knows both one and the other phase of the adolescent conflict between the body and the soul. He is capable of blasphemy and prayer. And he has imagination, chiefly of the panoramic sort. So many remarkable qualities united in the work of a poet only twenty-two years old make his volume worthy to be read; and the hope these qualities awaken of what he may become, makes his volume worthy to be studied.

I call him a poet not because of his fluency of verse, which is largely a matter of repatterned auditory reminiscence, nor because of the content of his work, which is as yet devoid of message; but because his best pieces are alive. They have an individual existence, apart from what they say or how they say it. They seem to have sprung full-grown from their creator's mind. They are born, not made. But, on the other hand, he is as yet neither an important poet nor an accomplished one. He is not important, because he is empty of great things to say; and he is not accomplished, because he has not learned to say things perfectly. But he gives promise of becoming both important and accomplished; and the best service that may be rendered to him, therefore, is to point out what as yet he lacks and indicate the lines along which he must develop in order to become of real value to the reading world.

It is only because I appreciate and laud his easy spontaneity of utterance that I presume to call attention to his technical defects. He seems to write entirely by ear, just as some people play the piano, rather than by studious and consciously commanded artistry. The ardor of his composition almost disguises the fact that he really knows very little about rhythm; but the fact betrays itself in certain pieces, and once betrayed, grows evident in nearly all. For instance, he is unable to command blank verse, the most delicate of English rhythms. The lines in "Aiander" are thumpingly end-stopped and almost without variety of cadence. One wonders at how much the writer's ear has failed to hear in the blank verse of the masters,—Milton and Tennyson, for example. Again, in his *vers libres,* he lacks sureness of auditory purpose in his alternation of long lines with short,—the kind of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sureness, I mean, that Wordsworth exhibits in his ode on "Intimations." He obeys the dictates of his rhythmic mood, rather than making his rhythmic mood obey the dictates of his mind. For this reason he almost always fails to maintain a stanzaic form that he has invented, and changes his mind about the form with each new stanza. He defends this practice in his preface; but a poet, with the example of the odes of Keats before him, admits weakness when he pleads for unnecessary license. His longer poems are shaky in structure: it is evident that he began to write them before he had them firmly built. He dashes gallantly through the province of a poem, instead of marching firmly to take possession of reconnoitred ground. Because of the weakness of his structural sense, his sonnets are less effective in their form than in their content. The reason for all these defects is that Mr. Viereck has not prepared himself for composition by a thorough study of the greatest versifiers. He has allowed his ear to be allured by the magic of minor masters; and being over-gifted with natural facility, he has not entirely discovered how much he has to learn.

Again, it is only because I appreciate and laud the passion and the poignancy of the things he has to say that I presume to call attention to the fact that these things, as yet, are not of prime importance. He knows mightily the riot of the senses and has felt with anguish the growing-pains of the soul. But his experience seems entirely of the world within himself rather than of the world without him. He knows nothing about nature and very little about men and women; and what he knows about the gods has been taught him, not by looking on at life, but by his own fears and hectic eagernesses. His god is finally the Sphinx,—the master of those who do not know. Much of his eroticism is derived, and therefore prurient; some of his soul-sorrow is literary. Of love, in its higher aspects, he is as yet apparently innocent; and his beautiful sonnet on "Friendship" suggests sadly that he is still a seeker unsatisfied. What he needs chiefly is a broader experience of life, and a knowledge of ideality externalized. It is time for his emotions to cease feeding on themselves; it is time that he should discover elements of beauty in normal, healthy and objective life. It is time that he should learn the things that people really need to know, in order to speak them with his voice.

Mr. Viereck owes it to himself to fulfil his promise; and he owes it even more to those who wait for poets in the world. With

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his natural aptitude for utterance, he should not find it difficult to master English verse in ten years of unremitted labor. Whether or not he will find it difficult to grow to be a great man is another matter, and a more important one. Keats and Shelley were great men at Mr. Viereck's age; but with them the gods were hasty and allowed them little time. Mr. Viereck is as yet only a possibility; but his possibility is glorious. I, for one, will wait hopefully to see what he does with his life, himself and his work.

CLAYTON HAMILTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

PARIS: WASHINGTON.

PARIS, *June, 1907.*

IT is always idle and often dangerous to say before the event that a nation is coming to a turning-point in its fortunes, that a new departure in politics is imminent or to commit oneself generally to any similar sweeping assertion. So, whatever may be the consequences in the near or remote future, I will merely say that I have to note in the present communication a not unexpected, but, nevertheless, somewhat sudden, check to the Socialist movement, which means a great deal more than even a change of Government. It is now eight years since the Socialists, numbering at the time little more than fifty, took the lead in the French Chamber. M. Waldeck-Rousseau had just come into office and cast about for the means of parrying the silly practical joke—consisting in a collusion of the Monarchists with the Extreme Left—by which half a dozen Premiers before him had been victimized. He thought that the only way open to him was to annex bodily the whole Socialist group, by adopting such parts of their programme as appeared realizable and securing the concurrence of one of their strongest men. So it was that social reforms like the suppression of the courts-martial, liberty of association, an old-age pension fund, etc., took the place of purely political measures, and the Socialist Millerand became Minister of Commerce.

This combination worked tolerably well throughout the three years of the Waldeck-Rousseau and the two years of the Combes Governments. The Socialists checked their natural violence and consented to be disciplined into supporters of the Cabinet. On the other hand, the old Radical group tinged their professions of faith with as much Socialism as they could absorb and gradually

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

called themselves Radical-Socialists. The immediate result was that Governments appeared more stable and became of unwonted duration.

Nevertheless, it was evident to the clear-sighted that the alliance between such opposite elements as the Socialists and their *bourgeois* neighbors could only be kept up artificially, and by a tacit agreement between them to steer clear of inevitable crucial questions. Some very useful measures were passed by M. Millerand: for instance, the creation of Councils of Labor and the law on the liability of employers, whilst legislation upon strikes was considerably improved. But these reforms had been for twenty years on M. de Mun's programme as well as on that of M. Jaurès. Of distinctly Socialist transformations there was no mention, or they were introduced in a manner so unmistakably academical that the blunt Socialists outside Parliament never refrained from calling them humbug. Practically, the only common platform on which the Socialists combined with the Radicals without any danger was anti-clericalism, and the positive work achieved until the general election of 1906 was little more than the expulsion of the religious orders, the break with Rome and, finally, the separation of Church and State.

The election returned to the Chamber an overwhelming majority of anti-clericals, demonstrating that the power of the Church and the danger accruing from it were mere bugbears. In spite of the tremendous effort made by M. Piou (*vide* the Montagnini papers), the "*Action Libérale*" or Catholic party and the Monarchists did not make up a sixth part of the Chamber.

The situation henceforward was clear. The Socialists had gained a score of seats; the Radical-Socialists had adhered to several of their claims (viz., the nationalization of railways and mines, the income tax and old-age pensions); there was a most able Socialist in the Cabinet, M. Briand; and the real Premier, M. Clémenceau, was a Radical-Socialist. In consequence, the policy to be followed during the four years of the new Parliament ought to be the Radical-Socialist policy. The first week of the session was entirely filled by the memorable conversation between Jaurès and Clémenceau, the upshot of which was that anti-clericalism, being purely negative, had become as indifferent to the country as clericalism; that Socialism in its radical form, *i. e.*, Collectivism, was impossible; but that the Socialism of re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formers was in keeping with the wishes of the country appeared on the programme of the greater part of the majority, and therefore indicated the work which the Chamber ought to take up at once. In fact, the nationalization of railways—beginning with the Western Railway—the income tax and old-age pension were the chief topics of the Ministerial address read by M. Clémenceau.

The Socialists regarded them as the minimum which they ought to expect from a Radical-Socialist Ministry. As to the Radical-Socialists, there is every reason to believe that they looked upon these measures as mere electoral professions, political castles in the air, which are always talked about and never seen. No less than seven income-tax bills have been framed by successive Ministers, and discussed by as many Committees, without anything ever coming of them. Why, they probably asked themselves, should this comfortable state of affairs be changed under Clémenceau, rather than under Combes? Our Radical-Socialists, therefore, saw with perfect equanimity M. Caillaux tackle the eighth income-tax bill, and M. Clémenceau entrust to the Senate the nationalization of the Western Railway.

However, this tranquillity was soon to be disturbed. After a long and scandalous opposition from all the Conservative parties, Radicals as well as Monarchists, a law enforcing weekly rest was passed by the Chamber and put on its trial. The result might have been prophesied. The employed naturally welcomed their weekly holiday, but insisted that no reduction in their salary ought to follow, while employers resented the idea of more men being employed and smaller profits cleared. The opinions of both parties were soon echoed in Parliament, thanks to several strikes of exceptional duration; the *bourgeois* Radicals spoke of serious changes to be made in the law, and the Socialists assumed a threatening tone which had not been heard for many years on their benches. The "class contest" was beginning to be more than a scarecrow. After a few months, the law was so altered as to be virtually nullified; but the Socialists started an agitation unparalleled in the history of the Third Republic, which soon brought the conflict between them and the Radicals to the verge of exasperation.

There is no unanimity among the French Socialists, and even in the Chamber their union is often little better than a necessity;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but their practical organization has reached a perfection to which only religious associations have heretofore attained. The strength of this organization lies in the fact that it rests on definite and undoubted interests, being not exclusively political, but rather economic. The whole country is covered with a powerful network of trade-unions, in close connection with one another, and bound together by a General Labor Confederation, the seat of which is at the Labor Exchange of Paris. The existence of the trade-unions was made legal as early as 1884, and the federation of kindred unions was natural and spontaneous. But the General Confederation of unions of all kinds only took place three or four years ago, not without secret jealousy and disquietude on the part of the Government, which could not but feel that a central organization with a legal seat in Paris—the Labor Exchange was built by the State—large financial possibilities, and unquestioned authority constituted another government, set up against it.

It is with this tremendous power that the Radicals are now quarrelling.

The reader may wonder that they should have waited so long to enter upon open warfare with such dangerous enemies. But the enmity was not absolutely clear from the first. Some "companions" made no secret of the hopes they entertained of being able gradually to organize the Fourth Estate so strongly that the *bourgeois* would one day find themselves face to face with the whole proletariat; and the yearly threat of a universal strike on May 1st ought to have admonished the Radicals of the real intentions of the Confederation. But, as I have said, the Radicals still lived under the delusion that their political union with M. Jaurès in Parliament meant security everywhere.

They were suddenly aroused by a few rather startling moves of the Confederation.

At the same time that vast protest against the remodelling of the law on weekly rest was the order of the day, a Socialist movement was initiated in quarters where only a few years back it would have been supposed impossible. There have been, of late years, constant strikes of the workmen employed at Cherbourg, Brest, Lorient and Toulon in the naval arsenals, and there may be some connection between the spirit of lawlessness prevalent in those ports and the terrible series of disasters in the French Navy during the past two years. These mechanics do not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strike merely to have their wages raised or their hours shortened, —the fact is they are pretty well paid for little work,—but they insist that they have a right to form themselves into a trade-union in connection with the General Confederation, even though their employer be the State and their occupation that of national defence. This theory all successive Governments have naturally rejected. But their resistance never was sufficiently decided to preclude fresh attempts at securing corporate immunity. The consequence was that the tide rose instead of subsiding. In October last the Paris postmen struck in their turn, formed into syndicates and succeeded in having themselves entered at the Labor Exchange. Several of them were dismissed, but the General Confederation still keeps up an agitation to have them taken back. Finally, the elementary teachers, whose Socialist tendencies are every day growing stronger, transformed their friendly societies into trade-unions and would have affiliated them with the General Confederation if they had not met with an indignant interdict from M. Clémenceau. However, whether affiliated or not, the Confederation can boast, and does boast on every occasion, that, whenever the general strike is possible, the national defence in the ports, the postal services in Paris and education in most places shall be stopped, as well as railway traffic and the making of bread.

This prospect is dark, indeed, and its possibility might have been doubted had it not been for two manifestations of the violence latent in the Socialist circles. On March 9th, the electricians employed in the Paris works, dissatisfied with the trend of negotiations entered into by the Municipal Council with two rival companies, suddenly stopped work, and for two nights Paris was given up to the picturesqueness and dangers of torchlight. On the third night, M. Clémenceau sent in military electricians who worked as best they could, but this interference was violently denounced by M. Jaurès, who insisted that it amounted to setting the right of striking at naught, and a fresh agitation ensued. A few days later, a placard bearing the signatures of the members of the "Central Committee" and addressed to M. Clémenceau was posted up everywhere. This mysterious "Central Committee"—unheard of since the dark days of the Commune—simply told the Premier that, only a short time ago, he championed the syndicates of State Servants,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and reminded the Minister of Education of a certain untoward speech delivered by him—in the not very remote period when he was a Socialistic journalist—to the effect that the general strike ought to be the great object of the Socialists, and if the soldiers were sent by the Government against their suffering brethren, their rifles might not be discharged in the expected direction.

This bold interference of the Central Committee caused a commotion in Paris and roused the Government. M. Briand dismissed—against the decision of the special jury—a schoolmaster who had signed the placard, and M. Clémenceau found a pretext for imprisoning two other members of the Committee.

Even the grim appearance of the Central Committee, however, would have left the Parisians indifferent but for the object-lesson they had previously received from the electricians. This had much more than a transient effect. For the first time a tremendous power had been injured—the press, which nowadays depends almost entirely on electricity—and the outcry for two days' annoyance was much louder than it had been for many a dire injustice. For the first time, the Socialist papers found themselves alone, against all the rest of the press, in trying to explain and defend the strikers' action. For the first time, many an amateur in semi-Socialist literature felt that the game was serious and that he might be making a fool of himself. I have never seen the press so unanimous as it has been during the past three months in denouncing, as a "public danger," the work of the General Confederation, and calling upon the Government to be firm in the defence of Society. There has been a marked dearth of exciting political events, and yet the tone of the papers never was more excited.

Unfortunately for M. Clémenceau and his Cabinet, this unanimity has gone farther against Socialistic ideas than he would have liked, and the consequence is a highly paradoxical situation. The Chamber, like the press, has followed the Premier in his resistance to the General Confederation; so much so that M. Clémenceau would have run no risk in limiting the Syndicates to their natural business and introducing a bill against any political action on their part. The Socialists are now completely isolated, and M. Pelletan, one of the few Radical-Socialists who adhere to them, is deeply disgusted with his own group, whom he calls liars and renegades. But neither the press nor the Parlia-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment will be content with a shabby policy of resistance to outrages which the courts ought to be competent to repress. What they want is nothing short of a reversal of the programme adopted by both the Socialists and the Radical-Socialists. But, as I have said above, the outstanding points of this programme are the nationalization of the Western Railway and the income tax, and these two bills were the centrepiece of M. Clémenceau's Ministerial address. The Western Railway bill is opposed by the senatorial committee appointed for its examination, by all the great companies whose future it implicitly threatens, and by the seventy-seven French Chambers of Commerce without a single exception. The income-tax bill fares even worse. At a recent election of senatorial delegates, two ex-Ministers were left out on their stating that they were favorable to the bill.

M. Jaurès has already begun a campaign of intimidation which might force the Senate into obedience; but the Senate counts for little as compared with the press, and the average income—distinctly that of the journalist—is confessedly that which will most suffer. The unscrupulous but powerful and popular newspaper, "*Le Matin*," wages daily war against the bill, which at present has not the ghost of a chance.

Now the question is, first of all, What is to become of a Cabinet whose fortunes M. Clémenceau has solemnly bound up with those of the two bills? Clearly it must go to pieces the moment it is thrown against such an obstacle. M. Clémenceau is not likely to give up his own programme, and if he did, he would, in M. Ribot's words, rob the Moderates of their own policy, which would only be another manner of reinstating them in power, and of placing himself in an impossible position. Go, then, he must, and possibly will of his own accord, instead of stultifying himself.

Another question is, How is a majority to be found exclusive of the Radical-Socialist programme and the Radical-Socialist vote? Will it be strong enough to encounter the immense power organized by the Socialists and impersonated by the General Confederation of Labor, which is tainted with anti-religious and anti-patriotic fallacies, and is lawless and reckless?

This the future will answer, but the *bourgeois* unanimity in the press, compared with such a movement as that of the wine-growers refusing in seven departments to pay a farthing of their taxes, shows that the crisis may be very near.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WASHINGTON, *June, 1907.*

THERE is no doubt that the delegates of the United States to the second Hague Conference have been exceedingly well treated as regards assignments to the three important committees which are to deal respectively with the questions of arbitration, land warfare and maritime warfare. There still seems to be, however, some uncertainty concerning the position which the representatives of our Government will take concerning one interesting matter. When, on June 19th, General Horace Porter, one of our delegates, announced that the United States would reserve the right to present the question of a reduction of armaments, it was too hastily assumed that our State Department means to exercise the right. It may be averred upon the highest authority that, in the opinion of Mr. Root, the mooting of that question properly belongs to some European Power, and that only at the last moment, if at all, will the United States start a discussion of a proposal in which other countries are more deeply concerned. There are two reforms of moment, however, with regard to which it is settled that our delegates will stand forth as advocates of material changes in international law. For at least half a century we have been champions of the principle that the private property even of the subjects or citizens of a belligerent Power should be immune from capture at sea, unless it should be adjudged contraband of war. Our Government would have renounced privateering, and signed the Declaration of Paris, made in 1856, if the other signatories would have accepted that principle. It is expected that our delegates will now bring forward a similar proposal, but it remains to be seen whether Great Britain, which rejected the suggestion fifty-one years ago, is now inclined to take a different view of it. In 1856, she was far from being so dependent on the importation of breadstuffs from this side of the Atlantic as she is now. As regards the second object to which our efforts will be especially directed, Mr. Joseph H. Choate, the head of the American delegation, announced in a letter to M. Nelidoff, the President of the Conference, that, at the proper time, he should raise the question of prohibiting the collection by force of contract debts, a proceeding of which the latest example was the bombardment of Venezuelan seaports by the allied squadrons of Great Britain, Germany and Italy. Opinions differ as to the likelihood of an endorsement of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proposal by the Conference. Great Britain (with Egypt in mind), and Germany and Italy, that by violence made themselves preferred creditors of Venezuela, and secured the application of a part of the debtor's customs revenue to the liquidation of their claims, can scarcely be expected to assent to the proposed change in the law of nations. It seems, moreover, to have been assumed too hastily that, in recommending the Drago Doctrine, our Government would have the support of all the Latin-American republics. Two of those commonwealths—Brazil and Mexico—do not regard the doctrine with favor, and the representatives of Chile are expected to take a similar attitude. On the whole, the prospect of seeing the Drago Doctrine embedded in international law is not good.

The apprehension which seems to have been felt in some quarters that the destruction of the property of certain Japanese residents by a mob in San Francisco might provoke a demand for an indemnity, and that this demand, if pressed without a preceding recourse to the Courts, might create on the part of our people a resentment that would lead to war, has died away. It is true that some well-informed and thoughtful citizens of California still take a very serious view of the situation. For example, Mr. Benjamin Ide Wheeler, President of the University of California, speaking at a dinner given in New York on June 20th, expressed the belief that the conditions on the Pacific Coast, so far as Oriental peoples are concerned, are still very grave, and present to American residents in that section a question that will not be solved easily. He pronounced it a mistake to suppose that all we have to consider is whether or no the Japanese and Chinese shall be permitted to attend the schools frequented by white children, or that we have only to inquire whether or no certain Japanese have been assaulted or despoiled. The question, he says, is of much broader scope. It is whether or no the people of that coast shall become inoculated with Oriental ideas and customs. In a word, shall or shall not the States of the Pacific Coast suffer the same fate that has overtaken Hawaii? That is one view of the matter. A very different opinion was expressed on the same day in Washington by Viscount Aoki, the Ambassador of Japan. He insisted that there is no "situation" and no "question" between Japan and the United States. He averred that, on the contrary, the best of relations exist, and that there is no dispute under

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

diplomatic consideration. He pronounced it distressing that there should be agitation over trifles which are of purely local import, if of import at all. To the inquiry whether the so-called Progressive party, of which Count Okuma used to be the head, is strong enough, or likely to be strong enough, to secure his recall, Viscount Aoki pointed out that the Progressives do not possess a majority in the popular branch of the Tokio Parliament, and have no present prospect of securing one. He might have added that the so-called "Constitutionalists" and "Unionists," between them, greatly preponderate in that body, and both of those parties have refused to cooperate with the Progressives in the stimulation of anti-American sentiment. Moreover, within the last few days, the Progressive party itself has split upon that point. Viscount Aoki directed attention also to the fact that, while Japan might have, at the utmost, including its newly acquired subjects, a population of about 50,000,000, the United States have not far from ninety millions, and are incomparably richer. He declared, in fine, that no country could dominate the Pacific, and that it was absurd to suppose that Japan could ever hope to control so vast a commerce as China and other Asiatic countries are capable of developing. It was true, he admitted, that labor is cheap in Japan; but he was confident, he said, that the United States, with their constantly improving machinery, would always be able to produce commodities as cheaply. To the final question whether the war talk in Japan might not be stopped by official interposition, he replied that, while undoubtedly the Tokio Government could stifle it, such a proceeding might give the talk more importance than it deserved. There seems, by the way, to be no foundation for the report that our Navy Department is seriously considering the expediency of placing all of our battle-ships in the Pacific, leaving our seaports on the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico to be defended by monitors, armored cruisers, protected cruisers, submarines and gunboats. The newspaper discussion of the subject has had, however, a wholesome effect. It has fastened attention on the fact that we have it in our power to place within a few months no fewer than twenty-one battle-ships—three of which have a displacement of 16,000 tons, and four a displacement of about 15,000 tons—in the Pacific Ocean, a force with which Japan could not dream of competing.

Until the fact was brought out the other day in the Washington

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Star," few Americans were aware that we annually pay a considerable sum in pensions to persons who live in foreign countries. There are, it seems, no fewer than 5,268 such pensions. Of these 2,657 dwell in Canada, 600 in Germany, 495 in Ireland, 391 in England and 27 in Scotland. Even in Switzerland there are 70, and a like number in Sweden. In almost every other European State, and also in Australasia, China and Japan, there are at least a few individuals who receive yearly a pension voucher from our Government. The whole sum, however, thus disbursed is relatively inconsiderable, being only $750,000, whereas the total amount to be paid out on account of our pension list next year will fall but little short of $150,000,000.

Since we reviewed the status of the Presidential campaign a month ago, there have been some changes. The unanimous endorsement of the candidacy of Senator Knox by the Pennsylvania State Convention seems to have fallen flat. It has evoked no enthusiastic response even in New England, and scarcely any attention has been paid to it in the Central West, or in the Trans-Mississippi States. Judge Taft still appears to be certain to have the Ohio delegation behind him, but there are indications that his nomination might deprive the Republicans of the negro vote in that State. The indignation which has been worked up among negroes by Senator Foraker's exposure of the scanty evidence on which the colored companies accused of disorder in Brownsville were dismissed is threatening Republican supremacy in a number of States where the negro vote is large enough to turn the scale in closely contested elections. It seems to have been the fear of losing the negro vote that caused the Kentucky State Convention to refrain, the other day, from endorsing Judge Taft by name, though it commended the Roosevelt policies. The Republican State Committee of Kansas approved Judge Taft's candidacy some time ago, but that was before politicians had awakened to the possibility that the Brownsville incident might cause negro voters to support the Democratic nominee. On the whole, it now looks as if there would be a great many "favorite-son" delegations in the next Republican National Convention, and Colonel Henry Watterson, who is as good a prophet as any, might be right in believing that Governor Hughes, if he has the New York delegates behind him, may, in the end, get the nomination.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

MONDAY, *July 1.* Railway Securities and the Money Market.

WE have received the following communication:

"SIR,—In an article in the Editor's Diary of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW of recent date, 'President Roosevelt as an Ally of the Money Power,' it is stated that, by insisting upon the railroad and trust magnates obeying the laws regulating commerce as passed by Congress, and by trying to hold them responsible for their transgressions, President Roosevelt helps the money-lenders.

"You say that our capitalists could not have been prevailed upon to furnish money when we began building our transcontinental roads, after the Civil War, unless they were enticed to do so by the expectation of great profits. They were not *our* capitalists who furnished the cash for the building of the Union Pacific, for they were rather small in those times, and would scarcely have been able to furnish it. It was the Government—the people—who loaned funds for the purpose, and a hard and long fight they had to make to get back their own, long after the Union Pacific was abundantly able to pay back Government loans. And, further, it was to foreign capital that the promoters of the enterprise had to look at that time to put the work through.

"The country too thinly peopled in those times to permit the timid home capitalists to take ventures in far-off railroad enterprises? Indeed! *Comparasiones sunt odiosæ.* But our neighbor, Canada, could afford to build her Pacific road through the wilderness, and the road has not had to be reorganized, like nearly every one of our trunk lines; the Canadian Pacific was honestly built, has not been over-capitalized, its accounts have been properly kept and balanced and there has not been any juggling with stocks, so far as we are aware.

"No, sir. Those who have money to lend have always been ready to invest in safe enterprises at a fair or even relatively low rate of interest; if they now refuse to lend the big railroad and other corporations any more money at less than five and six per cent. on short-time notes, they have a very good reason for it. They have at last taken the lesson to heart that the great magnates have not been and are not as honest as they should be, and that they are apt to loot the treasury of the roads they have taken possession of by stock manipulations, in the same way as, but on a larger scale than, their forebears.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"To be sure, they are ever ready to invite the dear public to come into the game, and bring the funds which help to fill the coffers of the great captains, and then? *Caveat emptor!*

"Further, you opine that the six-per-cent. notes offered by the roads are to run just so long as Mr. Roosevelt's term will last? So it would seem that our worthy President has become an obstacle to the continuance of our vaunted prosperity, and no sooner will he have left the White House than the great captains will find all the money they want again at four per cent.

"I do not agree with this insinuation or indictment. So long as the railroad directors declare excessive dividends and enrich themselves and their friends, the money-lenders also will be entitled to five or six per cent. at least on their investments. Let the railroad directors declare fair dividends and put aside good sums of their surplus for maintenance, improvement and extension of their roads, and they will then not be obliged to go begging for money and put out notes at high interest. There is no reason why, at their present crisis, they should not be ready to part with some of the hoards they have made and help their own roads.

"Carelessness in operating the roads, losses made by maintaining excessive speed on roadbeds which cannot bear it without danger, insane competition among trunk lines, the building of unnecessary parallel lines and, last but not least, stock jugglery of the men in command—these are the main reasons, I think, of the present embarrassment and failure.

"Much the same do we see when we look into the affairs of most of the trusts. They are all over-capitalized; they all force the producer to sell as cheaply as possible—and to them only; they have transgressed the Interstate Commerce Law, and all of them have taken rebates from the railroads whenever they could get them, in order to stifle competition and force out private competitors.

"Everywhere and anywhere we turn our eyes we see the same hoggish greed to gain much, and more, and more, and never to be satisfied. That is the curse of our times, it seems, the curse of the 'ring.' After Roosevelt leaves the White House, the plutocrats will not come in again to rule by dishonesty and extravagant luxury, as they have done; for such prosperity as we now enjoy is no longer wholesome; it is false, offensive and riotous, and the sooner we sober up the better it will be for the future of the country.

"I am, sir, etc.,

"LEONARD WEBER.

"NEW YORK CITY."

In the article to which Mr. Weber refers, we endeavored to call attention to the indications that the war on the railroads had already brought distress, not only upon the roads, but upon those whom they serve. Upon this point we said:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Billions of dollars are needed immediately for a great expansion of facilities to meet obvious requirements and, for the first time in the history of the country, cannot be obtained. Bonds of the strongest railway corporations in the world are a drug on the market, and new issues for pressing needs are not dreamed of. Instead of being able to fund obligations at low rates of interest, nearly every large railway company has been compelled to pay excessive sums for temporary accommodations, thus inevitably inducing retrenchment in expenditures when extension of facilities is the chief need of both producer and consumer."

Not only is this statement absolutely true, but, since these words were printed, and since Mr. Weber's communication was received, Mr. Roosevelt has given public utterance to his own recognition of the threatened danger to the roads, to the shippers and to the country, which has resulted from his own war upon the railroads, while he has asserted, in his own words, the actual existence of the conditions set forth in the above quotation. All this he did in his recent speech at Indianapolis.

Mr. Weber, recognizing also that the railroads are paying high rates of interest for temporary accommodation, declares himself an unbeliever in our assertion that Mr. Roosevelt is "to-day, unconsciously, of course, the most effective ally of the money-lending power in the world, and bears a responsibility for a retrogressive movement surcharged with possibilities of disaster to the country and the people."

We are told that it is not Mr. Roosevelt or the war that he has stirred up which is the compelling cause of the inability of the railroads to sell new bonds, and of the ability of the money-lenders to exact from them high rates of interest for temporary accommodation. We are told that, on the contrary, these ills have fallen on the railroads on account of the dishonesty of their officers and directors; because they have declared excessive dividends; because they have lost vast sums of money by "maintaining excessive speed on roadbeds which cannot bear it without danger"; because of "insane competition among trunk lines—the building of unnecessary parallel lines, and, last but not least, stock jugglery of the men in command."

The temper of Mr. Weber's letter is significant. It is the temper of war, and is, therefore, unreasoning. A short time ago, indeed, the atmosphere was so surcharged with the electricity of battle, that one who was taking part in the combat against the rail-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

roads would not have listened to any reply or to any argument that was advanced for the purpose of opposing reason to the outcries of battling champions. Now this has been, fortunately, changed by the admission of the President himself that there has been much wild talk about over-capitalization, and that the railroads need friendly, and not hostile, treatment if they are to meet the demands of the country for the extension of transportation facilities.

The causes assigned by Mr. Weber for the present inability of the "strongest" roads—and it was to them expressly that we referred—to market securities, are not supported by the history of such securities. Before the present war on the roads, investors were content to buy good railroad bonds at prices which brought them a revenue of less than four per cent. It is only since the war was inaugurated that nearly all four-per-cent. railroad bonds have fallen below par. It is illustrative of the recklessness of the talk against railroads that the four-per-cent. bonds of the Union Pacific bring a little more than par, a significant reminder of the value of Government support instead of Government enmity. If the bad management of the railroads, and not the sudden hostility of politicians, were accountable for the loss of railroad credit with investors, the results would have been felt long ago. As a matter of fact, the investors were frightened and the money-lenders saw their chance of profit, immediately after the efforts of the politicians began to be formulated in legislation as well as in threats—legislation, it is well to repeat, that directly followed Mr. Root's "warning" that, if the States did not act as Mr. Roosevelt desires, the Federal Government would take away their constitutional powers by "judicial constructions." Not only were the State legislatures driven to enact predatory laws—for there is predatory politics, as well as "predatory plutocracy" and "predatory poverty"—but investors declined to buy railroad securities at prices for which the roads could afford to part with them. That this decline in the security market was due to sudden war and to its promised continuance is shown by the fact that up to its breaking out investors had been willing, and glad, to put their money into railroad bonds. Now was the time for the money-lender, and he improved it.

Not only is it not true that the bad management of the roads is accountable for the inability of the roads to sell their securities

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at remunerative prices; not only, Mr. Roosevelt confessing it, are the railroads not over-capitalized, but, as a matter of fact, over-capitalization of the ordinary stock corporation injures only those who subscribe and pay in the excessive capital; as to railroads, the belief that they differ from other corporations is fallacious. At the most, it can be said of railroads having no competition in States where there is no regulation, that they may fix rates at will, and in order to pay dividends on water. Most railroads have competition or are regulated, as to charges, by State or national laws; as to such railroads, the great majority, the over-capitalization argument cannot apply.

Nor, if it did, has the question anything to do with the price of bonds. Bonds represent a debt, and the interest on them must come out of earnings before any dividend is paid, whether the shares represent the true value of the profit or water.

Again, how can it be said, in view of what the law has attempted, and accomplished, in the way of preventing competition, that "insane competition among the trunk lines" has aided to imperil the credit of the roads? The purpose of regulation has been to compel competition by keeping parallel lines in mutually independent or even antagonistic hands, while it has also been its endeavor to deprive the public of the supposed fruits of competition by determining rates.

Not only are the roads not over-capitalized; not only is over-capitalization impossible so far as most of the roads of this country are concerned; not only are the other reasons—including the disastrous effect of fast trains and stock jugglery on the credit of the "strongest railway corporations"—not explanatory of the failure of credit among investors, but it is also true that Mr. Weber is wrong in saying that the payment of excessive dividends, and the consequent failure to "put aside good sums of their surplus for maintenance, improvement and extension," account for the "present crisis." As will readily be seen by any intelligent reader, this reason cannot be sound if the other reasons, already considered, are sound. But let that pass; both sets of reasons are unsound. It is not true that excessive dividends have been paid by the railroads of this country.

The figures that will most readily convince a critic of the railroads are naturally those of the Interstate Commerce Commission. In 1900, the statistician of the Commission stated, in its annual

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

report, that the share capital of the railroad was about $6,000,000,000. On only 3 per cent. of this stock was the dividend in excess of 8 per cent., while on 72 per cent. of the bonds the interest was less than 6 per cent.; and it was while the management of the roads was notoriously worse than it is now that the roads were enabled to borrow readily on terms more advantageous than they can now obtain. The average return on bonds and stock together was only 3.4 per cent. As Professor Seager says in his admirable "Introduction to Economics," the interest and dividend which the railroads pay to investors "seem, when the risks connected with such enterprises are considered, scarcely a fair, and certainly not an excessive, return."

One fact more may be added from Professor Veditz's American edition of the "Principles of Political Economy" by Professor Charles Guide, lecturer on Economics at the Paris Law School. Professor Guide says: "The average cost per mile for road and equipment in the United States is about $50,000, in Germany it is about $120,000, in France $130,000 and in England considerably more." As a matter of fact, the actual cost of road and equipment in the United States was, in 1900, a good deal more than the par value of the shares of stock placed on the market by the corporations and about equal to the total of the bonds and stock. There is no reason to be found in the physical value of the roads; in the amount of their business; in their prospects for the future; nor in the character of their management, which can account for the difficulty of selling securities in order to raise money to carry on work needed by the country; and, therefore, it is fair to say that the existing state of the public mind, which has been brought about by the war upon the roads and the threats of future war, is responsible for evils which the railroads are now experiencing—evils in which the whole country must share, if there does not come a change over the minds of a large body of men who have been stirred to the depths by such assertions and such reasoning as we have endeavored to answer. Fortunately, the leader of the disaster-breeding movement has shown some signs of withdrawal from his advanced position; but, on the other hand, there are, also, signs that the lesson which he has imparted cannot be eradicated from receptive minds without serious and persistent teaching such as that which saved the country from the silver craze of 1896.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER.

ELLIS HENRY ROBERTS
was Treasurer of the United States from 1897 to 1905. He was born in Utica in 1827. In 1851 he became editor and later part owner of the Utica "Morning Herald." He went to Congress from New York in 1871 and from 1889 to 1893 he was Assistant Treasurer of the United States. Among his published works are "Government Revenue, Especially the American System."

ROBERT DEC. WARD,
one of the founders of the Immigration Restriction League, is Assistant Professor of Climatology in Harvard University. He is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and of the Royal Meteorological Society of London, and a member of the *Deutsche Meteorologische Gesellschaft*. He has already contributed to this REVIEW on the subject of immigration.

LEILA MECHLIN
has been for seven years art critic of the Washington "Evening Star," and has made a study of the field of art in this country.

ORLANDO F. LEWIS
is the Superintendent of the Joint Application Bureau of New York City. This Department is maintained by the Charity Organization Society and the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, for the charitable treat-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment of homeless persons. Mr. Lewis has exceptional facilities for studying the individual cases of thousands of homeless persons. The Joint Application Bureau has co-operated with the Department of Health of New York City during the last year in the revision of the regulations of the sanitary code relating to the supervision and maintenance of common lodging-houses in New York City, and is at present engaged in bringing to public attention its latest investigations regarding vagrancy in the United States.

CRAMMOND KENNEDY,

a native of Scotland, came to New York in 1856. On completing his studies at Madison University in 1863, he became chaplain of the 79th New York Infantry, and was brevetted major for services in Tennessee and the Wilderness. In 1864-5, he lectured in England and Scotland on the Civil War. In 1869, he joined Henry Ward Beecher in establishing "The Christian Union," of which he became managing editor in 1870. Turning to law, he graduated from the Columbia Law School in 1878, and has practised in New York and Washington, his law business having been consolidated with that of the firm of Coudert Brothers. Mr. Kennedy is the author of a number of books, including "The Liberty of the Press," "Some Phases of the Hawaiian Question" and "The Capture of Aguinaldo."

HENRY A. BEERS

has been Professor of English Literature in Yale University since 1880. Among the important books he has written are "A Century of American Literature," "Nathaniel Parker Willis," "From Chaucer to Tennyson," "Initial Studies in American Letters," "A History of English Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century," and "A History of English Romanticism in the Nineteenth Century."

J. WALTER LORD,

a member of the Maryland bar, was educated at Princeton University and studied law at the Harvard Law School. He occupied a position in the Legal Department of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company until 1901, when he became associated with a law firm of which the late John K.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cowen became a member on his retirement from the Presidency of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company. For some time past, Mr. Lord has been the counsel of the Consolidation, Fairmont and Somerset Coal Companies; and, in the course of his professional duties, he has had occasion to study the legal phases of railroad regulation.

W. P. LIVINGSTONE,

a native of Scotland, was for over ten years the editor of "The Daily Gleaner," in Kingston, Jamaica, and afterwards the West-Indian and Spanish-American correspondent of the London "Times," in which capacity he travelled extensively, his more recent journeys including one through Haiti and Santo Domingo. He has made a special study of the West-Indian and American negro. He is the author of a work entitled "Black Jamaica," a narrative of racial evolution.

MAURICE LOW,

a native of London, England, was educated at King's College, London, and in Austria. He has made a special study of foreign politics, and has contributed a great number of articles on that and other subjects to American and English periodicals. Mr. Low is correspondent in Washington for the Boston "Globe" and the London "Morning Post."

LOUISE COLLIER WILLCOX

was born in Chicago. She is the daughter of a Unitarian minister, and was educated in France, Germany and England. Later, she studied for two years at the Conservatory of Leipzig, and for two years in Birmingham, England. She has lived in Virginia since 1887, and has been a contributor to "East and West," "The Chap-Book," "The Century," "The Outlook," "Poet-Lore," "The Times-Democrat" of New Orleans, "The Boston Transcript" and "The Evening Post" of New York. For several years, she has been a reader and adviser of one of the leading publishing houses, and has regularly contributed editorials to "Harper's Weekly."

EDWARD PORRITT

is a native of Bury in Lancashire, England. For several years he was connected with a number of English papers. In

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1884, he came to the United States and joined the staff of the St. Louis "Globe Democrat." Returning to England, he was employed for some time as a parliamentary reporter. He now resides in the United States as correspondent for important British newspapers. He writes besides for a large range of American periodicals. In 1893, he published "The Englishman at Home," an account of English government and institutions. In 1901, he finished "The History of the Unreformed House of Commons," which was published in two volumes by the University Press of Cambridge.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED